U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20515

April 7, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Collin Peterson, Chairman, Committee on Agriculture
Bob Goodlatte, Ranking Member, Committee on Agriculture

THRU: Rob Larew, Democratic Staff Director
Bill O'Conner, Republican Staff Director

FROM: John Jurich, Investigator

SUBJECT: Investigative Report on the Coordination of Agricultural Inspection Functions by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA, and the Customs and Border Protection, DHS

Attached is a copy of an investigative report following the completion of a staff inquiry into the joint activities of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The inquiry focused on the degree of coordination between APHIS policy making and CBP program implementation for the agriculture inspection function at ports of entry throughout the United States. It also examined the effects of the split authorities on the actual conduct of agricultural inspections of passengers and products at ports of entry in the field.

The review entailed interviews of both APHIS and CBP staff at headquarters offices in Riverdale, Maryland, and Washington, D.C., and at subordinate offices in nine cities and nineteen ports of entry in the field. I interviewed over two hundred and fifty APHIS and CBP managers, supervisors, and officers. More than one-half of these interviews were of CBP staff, mainly agricultural specialists, supervisors, and managers in the field who are actively engaged in various aspects of the inspection process at airports, seaports, and land border stations. The review also involved the analysis of program data and financial information provided by APHIS and CBP staff to complement and confirm oral statements provided by headquarters and field staff.

The results of the inquiry are decidedly mixed and difficult to summarize. Ports differed markedly one from another, as did personnel interviews. Both APHIS and CBP field staff, and to a lesser degree headquarters staff, were either decidedly in favor of, or hostile to, the transfer of function. Such attitudes deeply colored their remarks on the degree of coordination and cooperation between the two agencies and on the effects of the transfer of function on the inspection process itself.

Many of the staff, indeed a majority of the legacy agriculture personnel I interviewed with many years of field experience, spoke of the transfer as a kind of "hostile takeover," of coordination between the two agencies as simply nominal or non-existent, and of the result as a complete devaluation of the agriculture mission in the field. However, others spoke of the transfer as a positive step forward for the agricultural mission with much greater professionalism and accountability, a sharper focus on specific safeguarding duties, better access to information technology, increased targeting capabilities, and the imposition of much needed discipline. Some even managed to cite elements of both points of view in single interviews.

The analysis of the programmatic and performance data was almost as conflicting as the statements in interviews. Major performance measures, the numbers of inspections and interceptions, declined in 2004, 2005, and 2006 in many significant pathways. The impact was most severe at the airport terminals where inspections, interceptions, and violations show the most marked declines. The impact in the cargo area was more mixed with an increase in regulated cargo inspections, clearances, and pest interceptions, and a corresponding decline in miscellaneous cargo inspections and clearances. Overall quarantine material interceptions of pests, animal products, and plant products also declined.

There are several reasons for such equivocal results: the turmoil inherent in the consolidation of staffs from three separate agencies; the integration of personnel with very different backgrounds and skill sets; the division of equipment and space; systems incompatibilities; and other administrative hurdles. The decline in many core performance measures, the number of inspections and quarantine material interceptions, reflects the impact of adverse changes that followed rather quickly upon the transition. The increase in regulated cargo clearances, inspections, and pest interceptions probably reflects the agency's recognition of the threat posed by cargo pathways and the consequent assignment of its more seasoned agricultural staff to manifest review, targeting, and inspection sites.

Adverse changes over the first three years include the exodus of many agricultural specialists and supervisors from CBP; the lack of adequate numbers of replacements; the transfer of the legacy agricultural leadership out of positions of line authority; the installment in their place of legacy customs or immigration managers and supervisors unfamiliar with the inspection process or the science that supports it; the resultant contretemps with agricultural staff struggling, often futilely, to explain to non-agricultural supervisors and managers why they did things the way they did and why the CBP way would not necessarily work well in the agricultural area; and the severance of many forms of communications with APHIS staff and other partner agencies. They also reflect the loss of many perquisites that officers enjoyed under APHIS including a wide degree of autonomy and independence, as much overtime as they wanted, and ready access to ample office space, desks, cabinetry, supplies, and equipment.

Many other changes, although not in and of themselves adverse, differed from the accustomed norms and proved difficult for many of the legacy agricultural staff:

scheduling changes, compartmentalization of work assignments, loss of rotations, learning new computer systems, and adherence to a strict chain of command to mention but a few. Some agricultural officers resented the effect of the legislation itself, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, the attendant loss of the parent organization, APHIS, with its abundance of technical resources and opportunities for professional advancement, and the subordination of the agriculture mission to the fight against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. Others did not appreciate the addition of legacy customs and immigration duties such as looking out for illegal aliens, illicit drugs and alcohol, currency violations, or intellectual property rights items during the inspection process. All of these factors stressed significantly both the agricultural mission and the agricultural specialists who were engaged in the inspection process. Morale generally plummeted and the work suffered significantly the first few years of the merger.

However, many of the personnel I interviewed, both critics and partisans of the change, acknowledged that there have been decided improvements over the past year and a half at the ports of entry for the agricultural specialists and the agricultural mission. Staffing has finally increased, although not nearly in the numbers needed. Performance data, too, has shown some improvement. Coordination at the headquarters level has always been high, buttressed by regular contacts between senior executive staff and strong personal relations among CBP's Agricultural Policy and Liaison staff and APHIS' Quarantine Policy and Analysis Staff. Coordination at field levels still varies widely from port to port. At a few ports such as Miami and Long Beach, cooperation was excellent between APHIS and CBP personnel. At other ports there were still various barriers to communication and subsequently less cooperation between APHIS field units and CBP port authorities.

There remain many challenges for both APHIS and CBP in coordinating policy requirements with inspection procedures in the field. Primary among the challenges is redressing the manpower shortages that severely affect the ability of CBP staff to provide adequate inspection coverage to major sea, air, and land pathways. In many of the ports I visited the numbers of inspection personnel, those actually looking at fruits, vegetables, flowers, herbs, meat products, and packing materials for pests, prohibited products, and plant diseases, were simply inadequate for the tasks at hand. This has occurred even though CBP has filled all of the early vacancies and increased the number of agricultural staff at the ports of entry. An explanation for this anomaly is given in the attached report.

Additional challenges include improving feedback mechanisms from field levels to managers and policy makers. CBP's chain of command works well in tasking from the top to the bottom, but it seems also to frustrate communications in the opposite direction. A simple example of this was field managers' general assumption that low morale among their agricultural staff was due to the loss of overtime which had been doled out in lavish amounts by APHIS prior to the transfer of function. Although mentioned now and then by agricultural staff, the primary reason for the discontent was their inability under CBP procedures, staffing, and supervision to perform their safeguarding mission. CBP

managers invariably told me that they supported the agricultural mission in their districts and ports. The specialists stated, not quite as often, just the reverse.

The Committee inquiry began with an eventual hearing in mind. Therefore, I have attached to this memorandum not only the report but also a list of APHIS and CBP officials, of the leadership in Washington and of personnel in the field, who I believe would make good witnesses. The list includes their titles and general duties with APHIS or CBP.

Attachments

## POTENTIAL WITNESS LIST

Headquarters Leadership

1. W. Ralph Basham, Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – agency head

2. Dr. Ron DeHaven, Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA – agency head

3. Jayson P. Ahern, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – in charge of 19,000 field inspectors, including the agricultural specialists

4. Richard L. Dunkle, Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and Quarantine, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA – in charge of plant protection headquarters units and field staff

Headquarters Liaisons

1. Jeffrey J. Grode, Executive Director, Agricultural Policy and Liaison, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – the primary CBP liaison with APHIS at the headquarters level and a former special assistant to the administrator of APHIS

2. William Thomas, Director, Quarantine Policy and Analysis Staff, Plant Protection and Quarantine, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA - the primary APHIS liaison with CBP at the headquarters level

Field Office Officials

1. Pete Mayea, CBP Chief , Cargo Operations, Miami, FL, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – in charge of agricultural air cargo and express mail operations at Miami Airport who can give a CBP perspective on APHIS staff and absorption into CBP's structure and culture, a chief praised by both APHIS and CBP staff for agricultural knowledge and leadership abilities.

2. Mike Wright, Assistant Director, Trade Operations, District Field Office, Miami, FL, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – former APHIS Port Director for Miami, now an Assistant Director for Trade Operations in Miami district field office.

3. David G. Talpas, Assistant Director, Agriculture Policy & Planning, District Field Office, San Francisco, CA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – former APHIS Port Director for San Francisco, now an agricultural program advisor to the District Field Director in San Francisco.

4. Lisa Krekorian, Agricultural Supervisor and Acting Agricultural Chief, Air Passenger Operation, International Airport, San Francisco, CA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – knowledgeable about air passenger operations, also a former canine officer

5. Hal S. Fingerman, Agricultural Chief, Philadelphia, PA, and Acting Agricultural Liaison for the District Field Office in Baltimore, MD, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – former port director for Philadelphia, now in charge of all agricultural operations at the airport and seaport in Philadelphia and a temporary advisor to District Field Director in Baltimore.

6. Terry London, Agricultural Chief, Long Beach, CA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS – responsible for agricultural cargo inspections for the busiest container port in the country. She was also a supervisor at the land border station in San Ysidro, CA

# U.S. House of Representatives
## Committee on Agriculture
### Washington, D.C. 20515

April 7, 2007

MEMORANDUM REPORT

## Scope

This inquiry was conducted to review the joint activities of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in coordinating policy making and program implementation of the agriculture inspection function at ports of entry throughout the United States. The staff inquiry supplements in many ways recent reports by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the USDA and DHS Offices of Inspector General (OIG) on various aspects of this agricultural inspection function. Our inquiry focused on the degree of cooperation and coordination between the two agencies, both at headquarters and field office levels, and on the effect of the split authorities on the conduct of the agricultural inspections at the ports of entry.

## Methodology

The inquiry involved visits to nine port cities: Baltimore, Philadelphia, Miami, New York, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego for interviews of APHIS and CBP field staff, as well as interviews of APHIS and CBP program staff at headquarters offices in Washington, D.C., and Riverdale, Maryland. I tried to visit major airports ands seaports, as well as busy land border stations adjoining both Canada and Mexico, to get a sense of how APHIS policy and CBP procedure interacted at the larger ports of entry into this country.

The field work encompassed interviews of one hundred and thirty CBP agricultural chiefs, supervisors, specialists, and technicians who worked at eight airports, seven seaports, and four land borders stations in or near the aforementioned cities. I also interviewed twenty-one CBP managers, supervisors, and agriculture liaisons assigned to district field offices or ports of entry. These included directors of field offices, port directors, assistant port directors, program managers, chiefs, first line supervisors, and operations officers. Finally, I interviewed an additional thirty-five CBP agriculture staff who between 2003 and 2006 returned to USDA, both to Riverdale and to offices in the field. These returnees were primarily agriculture specialists from field locations. Their duty stations while in CBP were the Detroit land border; San Francisco airport; Wilmington seaport; Buffalo land border; Philadelphia airport and seaport; Trenton airport; Anchorage airport; Blaine land border; Orlando airport; Oakland airport and seaport; Miami airport and seaport; New York airport, and Bangor airport.

The field interviews of CBP agricultural staff were for the most part a selected sample. I first contacted legacy agricultural staff, who had worked for CBP at the ports I intended

to visit and then returned to APHIS. I also contacted APHIS officials presently working close to these ports in nearby field units. I asked all of these contacts to provide me with a list of names of those CBP senior agriculture specialists, supervisors and managers who in their opinions had the highest professional reputations for doing good work. I asked in particular for the names of CBP agriculture specialists who were known for conducting thorough inspections and finding significant numbers of interceptions. I next provided the names of the officers I was given to CBP liaisons at each district field offices along with a request for additional interviews with port managers having oversight of agricultural functions, a few recent graduates from the new officer training academy in Frederick, Maryland, and at least one dog handler. The selection of these latter CBP personnel was made by the liaisons and port officials.

In addition to the field interviews of CBP staff, I visited as many of the APHIS State Plant Health Director (SPHD) offices and Plant Inspection Stations (PIS) as time and location permitted for interviews of APHIS field personnel. I interviewed state plant health directors from New Jersey, Florida, Michigan, and California; a variety of PIS personnel including officers-in-charge, veterinary regulatory officers, entomologists, botanists, and safeguarding officers from Miami, South San Francisco, Detroit, Los Angeles, and San Diego; and several managers, supervisors, and field investigators from Smuggling Interdiction and Trade Compliance (SITC) and Investigations and Enforcement Services (IES) assigned to locations in regional offices and in the field.

To complement the interviews of CBP and APHIS field personnel, I met with many of the headquarters cadre of managers and support staff working in CBP's Agriculture Policy and Liaison (APL) office in Washington and APHIS' Quarantine Policy and Analysis Staff (QPAS) in Riverdale. Both staffs act as the primary interface between CBP's Office of Field Operations and APHIS' Plant Protection and Quarantine at the headquarters level.

Finally, I spoke with various stakeholders from the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the New York State Department of Agriculture & Markets, the North Carolina Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, the National Plant Board, and the Floral Importers of Florida, to obtain their perspective on the transfer of function.

It should be noted that the interviews were conducted in private with the assurance that the information would be considered confidential and that statements would not be attributed by name in a report to the committee. It should also be noted that both agencies, CBP and APHIS, were wholly responsive to the committee's review and my requests. All of the personnel I asked to speak to were made available with only a handful of exceptions. The few whom I did not interview were either on leave or extended assignments elsewhere. Both agencies provided accommodations that ensured privacy. CBP and APHIS personnel, both the liaison staff who assisted in arranging the field visits and the employees whom I interviewed, were extremely courteous, accommodating, insightful, and in my opinion absolutely forthright. I am appreciative of

their thoughtfulness, help, and candor. I also applaud the dedication of both APHIS and CBP staffs who carry out the agricultural safeguarding mission.

The interviews of field and headquarters staffs were augmented by an analysis of program and financial data provided by both APHIS and CBP. These included fiscal year summaries of APHIS' Work Activity Data (WADS); Agriculture Quarantine Inspection Monitoring (AQIM); and Pest Interceptions (PIN 309), as well as summaries of CBP's financial and program activity data.

## Merger Background

The immediate effects of the transfer of function in 2003 were very challenging for CBP and the legacy agricultural staff. A brief chronology of the change will explain why. First of all, APHIS retained a substantial number of port personnel to carry out a limited number of retained port responsibilities, basically the inspection of live plants, the identification of pests and quarantine materials intercepted at the ports of entry, the fumigation of infested commodities, and safeguarding. The retention left many of the CBP ports with a shortage of officers from the very beginning of the transfer of function in May of 2003. Of the 2,655 positions agriculture positions transferred to CBP by APHIS, 387 slots were vacant. 317 of these vacancies were in the PPQ officer series, approximately twelve percent of the agricultural inspection staff. One legacy agricultural port director stated that she was left without a single officer to conduct inspections at her east coast seaport shortly after the transfer date. Another legacy agricultural technician, a part time employee, stated in similar fashion that he was left at his northern airport for almost two years without an agricultural inspector within fifty miles of his port. Such vacancies severely affected the ability of CBP to perform the agricultural mission in full from the onset of the merger.

Secondly, the absorption of the remaining PPQ officers into CBP's structure and culture about the start of FY2004 was traumatic. The merger resulted in legacy agricultural staff losing offices, cars, computers, professional status, and a like leadership. Not a single APHIS manager at the ports I visited was selected as a port director or assistant port director within the CBP structure when permanent managers were selected in late 2003. Many of the agricultural port directors and some supervisors were gradually shifted from line authority over agricultural staff to basically consultative positions or given administrative functions. Many of these agricultural officials were replaced by managers, chiefs, and supervisors from either legacy customs or legacy immigration agencies with supervisory authority over agricultural staff. Many of the specialists at this time also lost their offices, individual desks, and cabinets. In addition, basic equipment and supply needs in many ports went unfulfilled for substantial periods of time.

More importantly than the loss of space and the absence of supplies, the agricultural line officers also lost a large degree of autonomy and authority. The cultural chasm between the two agencies was and still is immense. The basic tools of the APHIS PPQ officer were a buck knife, a hand lens, and a microscope. The tools of the CBP officer are a badge and gun. APHIS, as its tools suggest, is a scientific and regulatory agency. It has a

collegial culture that operates to a great degree by inclusion and consensus. The PPQ officer was generally a trusted member of the collegial staff. The officer usually possessed a scientific degree, or multiple degrees, and was empowered by management to make regulatory decisions alone in the field. Supervision was often at a minimum. Within the officer's discretion was not only the authority to select, inspect, and regulate both people and products transiting through the ports of entry, but also the freedom to contact, either locally, regionally, or nationally, animal and plant subject matter experts when confronted with a regulatory problem or question. The officers also had the authority to call colleagues in SITC, IES, and Veterinary Services as well as officials in partner agencies when the occasion required such contact. A PPQ officer in the field calling a peer or contacting a higher level official in the state plant health director's office, a regional office, or in Washington, D.C., was not uncommon. Policy decisions, both at state, regional, and national levels, were made generally with input from port officials which included local inspection staff and representatives of the employee's union.

In contrast, CBP is primarily an enforcement agency with a paramilitary structure, a strict chain of command, an emphasis on rank and grade, and an insistence on discipline and obedience from the rank and file officers. It operates in many respects by exclusion on a need to know basis. Decisions are made by managers with much less input from rank and file staff. The CBP agricultural specialist is tasked with responsibilities by his superiors and expected to obey. If he has a regulatory question or concern, his basic recourse apart from the manuals is his supervisor, a GS-12. To leap over a supervisor to talk with a chief, a GS-13, or a higher grade was considered a breech of this command structure. A call to an outside agency such as APHIS for information or advice was sanctioned in many ports only by the express approval of a supervisor or chief.

Many of these supervisors and chiefs as a result of the transfer of function and subsequent departures were legacy customs and immigration officers whose immediate knowledge and understanding of the agricultural function was either limited or nil. This fact led in many ports to a good deal of misunderstandings and conflict between CBP first and second line supervisors and legacy agriculture staff. From the perspective of the supervisors and chiefs difficulties arose from the reluctance or outright refusal of legacy agriculture staff to accept orders and embrace change; from the perspective of agriculture staff the strife was occasioned by a lack of concern by management for the agricultural mission and for the adverse effect many of the changes were having on their safeguarding mission.

As a result of these differences, the two years following the merger, 2004 and 2005, saw an exodus of legacy agriculture staff, both officers and technicians, from CBP. Many returned to APHIS, several jumped to other agencies, some opted for retirement, and others simply quit their jobs. The agency lost approximately one-hundred and thirty specialists over the first few years to APHIS alone. Some CBP officials termed the APHIS selection of their specialists and supervisors in the field "cherry picking." The term is appropriate for almost every senior CBP agriculture specialist I interviewed stated in so many words that the best and the brightest had left the agency. CBP, itself, was

slow to respond to increasing shortages of agriculture inspection staff. The hiring and training of replacements, once begun, was a lengthy and time consuming process. The New Officer Training Center in Frederick, Maryland, graduated only three classes of 83 agriculture specialists in FY2004 and approximately 190 specialists from classes which started in FY2005. The departures and lack of replacements stressed even further an already depleted staff.

Staffing at many of the ports I visited was also affected by additional structural differences between the two agencies. Single ports under the APHIS field command were, or became, multiple ports under the CBP structure. Agricultural staff from one port was no longer available to work routinely at a companion port. This difference weakened the ability of agricultural staff to provide adequate coverage to both major and minor pathways and adversely affected the conduct of inspections and the capture of interceptions. Many of the major CBP ports also chose to spread agricultural staff out onto various shifts as a way of responding to industry and inspection needs. Some of the ports went to a twenty-four hour a day and seven day a week schedule. Others went to a variety of hourly and daily schedules. This was done at times with an already threadbare staff. Overtime, which was used lavishly by APHIS to inspect people and products outside of core hours, was gradually reduced for agriculture staff. Many of the larger CBP ports also compartmentalized duties according to customs practices. Agricultural personnel were incorporated into various work units with other CBP personnel. The net effect of the broader scheduling and the compartmentalization was to further dilute the number of staff available for their primary task, that of inspections.

In fairness to CBP, the merger was also hampered by a number of weaknesses and failures in APHIS' managerial and officer ranks. Port management was generally lax and subordinate staff was to some degree undisciplined. Managers and supervisors tended to ignore or tolerate problems in conduct and performance. Slovenly dress and appearance, idleness, absences, and even drug or alcohol abuse by subordinate staff were often neither promptly nor properly addressed. These kinds of problems plus the lavish amounts of overtime offered to the rank and file officers served as disincentives for many of the senior PPQ officers to opt into supervisory and managerial ranks. In contrast, many of the legacy agricultural specialist supervisors I spoke to over the past year praised CBP for demanding a much stricter accountability from its staff, for imposing discipline, and for providing a broad array of administrative support to them in dealing with such abuses.

The net effect of many of the above changes in carrying out the agriculture mission under CBP was a decrease in a number of overall performance statistics in 2004 and 2005. The following categories declined: total ships inspected; total aircraft inspected; total reportable pests; total miscellaneous cargo clearances; total miscellaneous cargo inspections; total violations issued; and total plant material interceptions. The most severe decreases occurred in aircraft inspections, reportable pest interceptions, miscellaneous cargo clearances, and violations. A secondary effect was a precipitous decline in morale among legacy agricultural staff.

## GAO and OIG Reports

GAO, USDA OIG, and DHS OIG have reviewed the effects of the transfer of function from APHIS to CBP upon the agriculture inspection component at the ports of entry. USDA OIG issued the first report in March of 2005 entitled "Transition and Coordination of Inspection Activities between USDA and DHS." GAO next issued two reports in May and November of 2006 entitled "Management and Coordination Problems Increase the Vulnerability of U.S. Agriculture to Foreign Pests and Disease" and "Homeland Security: Agriculture Specialists' Views of Their Work Experience After Transfer to DHS." Finally, DHS OIG and USDA OIG issued a joint report in February of 2007 entitled "Review of Customs and Border Protection's Agricultural Inspection Activities."

The first report by USDA OIG in 2005 focused on APHIS and CBP implementation of processes and procedures to ensure the timely and effective coordination of inspection activities. The report concluded that APHIS needed to improve its coordination with CBP to ensure that proper safeguards were implemented and that APHIS personnel had access to all information needed to verify that U.S. Agriculture was being protected. The review noted problems with the timely implementation of specific protocols as to their respective responsibilities, with inadequate risk assessments, with significant reductions in pest interceptions, with access to ports, with the performance of joint port reviews, and with cost data. The report recommended *inter alii* that the agencies develop a process to resolve material issues at higher levels of the agencies. It also noted that OIG would be following up its review with a joint audit with the DHS at specific port locations since the initial review did not encompass site visits to any ports of entry.

GAO conducted its review of CBP's agricultural inspection function in 2006 which did include visits to a number of ports of entry and a subsequent survey of CBP field personnel. In its first report in May, GAO praised the agency for its training and targeting initiatives, for developing a process to assess how agricultural specialists were implementing policy, and for establishing agricultural liaison positions in each of its district offices. GAO also noted, however, that CBP faced continuing management and coordination problems that increased the vulnerability of U.S. agriculture to foreign pests and disease. Specifically, the agency did not focus on a number of key pathways such as commercial aircraft, vessels, and truck cargo. It also did not have a risk based staffing model to ensure that adequate numbers of specialists were staffed in areas of greatest vulnerability. Finally, GAO noted problems in information sharing, in the proficiency of canine teams, and in the transfer and accountability of user fees.

In its second report in November of 2006, GAO reviewed the narrative responses to its survey of CBP agricultural specialists to identify common themes and their relative percentages among the survey respondents. GAO noted that there was a four fold increase in the number of pages of narratives about what needed to be changed or improved compared to what was being done well. On the negative side, approximately sixty percent of the specialists who responded to the survey indicated they were performing fewer inspections and making fewer interceptions. Similarly, about sixty

percent stated that CBP management did not respect their work. Approximately thirty percent of the specialists expressed concerns about working relationships with CBP officers and managers who did not view that agricultural mission as important as anti-terrorism or anti-narcotics activities; about the lack of priority as evidenced by a decline in inspections of flights and cargo due to staffing shortages and scheduling decisions; and about the impedance of timely actions due to a lack of agricultural managers and a rigid chain of command structure. The second most frequent response in the survey to the positive question, "What is going well?" was the negative response, "Nothing is going well."

On the reverse side, about twenty percent of the agricultural specialists stated that the working relationship with CBP officers was positive including increased respect and interest in the agricultural side of the work. Ten percent stated that salary and benefits were better. Lastly, six percent were generally satisfied with their jobs and working relationships with CBP officers and managers. GAO concluded that such results were indicative of morale issues among the agricultural specialists.

The most recent report on the agricultural inspection function at the ports of entry was issued by DHS OIG and USDA OIG in February of 2007. The joint audit focused on transition issues and problems previously identified in USDA OIG's earlier audit report. The joint report concluded that CBP generally conducted agricultural activities in compliance with procedures at the ports the audit team visited. However, improvements were needed to ensure that Agricultural Quarantine Monitoring (AQIM) sampling, staffing, and performance measures were adequate. The sampling at four ports did not meet policy requirements for thirteen of eighteen pathways; while the agency needed a current staffing model and performance measures for agricultural specialists to ensure the most effective use of personnel. The audit report also noted deficiencies in cut flower inspections and in the application and documentation of Work Accomplishment Data System (WADS) activity codes. The report contained ten recommendations for CBP and three for APHIS. All of the CBP recommendations have been resolved by the agency. Two of the APHIS recommendations are pending decisions by agency management. The third awaits the submission of implementation dates for closure.

## Present Policy Making and Program Implementation

That the normal dynamic between policy making and the management and conduct of inspections in the field has been complicated by the transfer of function is without dispute. Two agencies now govern the process, agencies located in separate departments under different management structures with dislike cultures, organizational paradigms, and work practices and procedures. The obvious impact is simply delay: policy, once drafted by policy makers, is now vetted through two agencies instead of one. Policy officials, program coordinators, liaisons, legal staff, and managers from two agencies now may be charged to read, review, and amend the drafts prior to issuance. The approval and issuance process simply takes longer than before, especially when there are differences of opinion on the degree of necessary change in a new policy, its impact upon trade, or the effect the new policy will have on personnel and procedures at the ports of

entry. The liaison staffs at CBP and APHIS each tended to fault the other on occasion for causing undue delays in the issuance of new policy. I assumed the process itself, not the participants, was the main culprit.

The normal feedback mechanisms between field staff and policy makers have also been disrupted. Security clearances, proprietary concerns, systems incompatibility, and the chain of command hinder to some degree the free flow of information back to APHIS policy makers. The policy makers simply do not have quick and ready access to field managers and to subordinate staff to see how a policy is working or what problems need corrective actions. APHIS headquarters staff stated that they feared they were basically making policy in a void. Some of the inspection problems detailed in this report lend credence to this fear, especially in instances where APHIS policy dictates and CBP port procedures clash.

The dissemination of policy to the field in CBP as noted earlier by GAO continues to be somewhat problematic. The chain of command requires the passing of information from headquarters, through the district field offices, to the ports of entry. Within each layer is another hierarchy of officials, district field director, assistant field director for trade operations, agricultural liaison, port director, assistant port director for trade, program manager, chiefs, supervisors, and finally agricultural specialists. Policy changes, alerts, lookouts, manual changes, and other information are generally passed from one level to another, unless districts or port managers have authorized a different form of delivery. According to APL staff most of the alerts submitted by APHIS to APL were processed and sent out to the field either the same day they were received or a day later, unless a week end intervened. Likewise both field office and port officials stated that they forwarded policy guidance and alerts quickly down the chain of command usually via their e-mail system.

However, many of the field specialists stated that they did not receive the policy directives or alerts that quickly or sometimes at all. The specialists were generally aware of major policy changes such as the regulations governing solid wood packing material or the recent restrictions on importation of beef products from Canada. They were also aware of the many alerts on avian influenza that traced the gradual spread of the disease from Asia, to Europe, and into Africa. But they were also ignorant of many other less newsworthy alerts that had been forwarded lately to CBP by APHIS staff. Many CBP specialists mentioned that they were the last party to receive alerts or other changes. They learned about them earlier either from reading the newspaper, surfing the web, or by conversing with brokers and other industry representatives.

In some instances, CBP agriculture supervisors at the ports of entry had folders or computer directories with numerous alerts that they had distributed either orally or via Lotus Notes to subordinate staff. Yet, when asked, their subordinate specialists barely recalled one or two. It was difficult to say whether the problem was the staff's inattention to e-mails and muster information, retention, or the press of other work. One specialist stated that he was so inundated with terrorism and drug alerts in his e-mail

directory that he generally ignored reading alerts at all. His attitude may well be indicative of many of his peers.

Many of the senior agriculture specialists I interviewed stated that the number of agriculture alerts and policy directives received via the CBP chain of command was considerably less than those that had been distributed in shotgun style directly to them by APHIS headquarters prior to the merger. The same was true of manual changes with one significant exception. Many of the specialists still received by e-mail each and every manual change issued by the manual division in Riverdale directly from John Patterson, the APHIS division director. These specialists stated that this method insured that the change was noted immediately, not later when the specialist had the time or need to consult the manuals on the internet. However, many others depended solely on recourse to the electronic manuals to become aware of a recent change in inspection procedures.

Other complications occur in the field where APHIS policy and CBP inspection practices and procedures intersect. For instance, recent changes in the restrictions on the entry of unmarked solid wood packing material were ignored at a few of the ports I visited. I was informed by the agriculture specialists that APHIS protocols now called for an entire shipment of products to be returned to the foreign port of origin if any of the pallets lack requisite markings indicating that they had been treated for wood boring pests. This policy was not being unilaterally enforced at all ports. Specialists were being told to allow brokers or consignees to manipulate shipments, in other words to separate the marked from the unmarked pallets and allow the marked pallets entry. Only the unmarked pallets were refused entry. According to the inspectors, this was a violation of present policy and a safeguarding risk. It was done according to the inspectors at the insistence of port managers, chiefs, or supervisors to accommodate the industry and to facilitate trade.

Another example of such conflict is the performance of AQIM cargo inspections at certain ports of entry. AQIM monitoring is a statistical sampling methodology that ascertains the approach rate of prohibited pests and diseases. AQIM sampling of cargo is governed by strict protocols including hypergeometric tables which mandate how many boxes of a particular commodity and shipment needs to be inspected. Again, at a number of ports I was informed by agriculture specialists that their CBP inspection schedule, which mandated one inspection per hour, was inadequate at times to perform the AQIM sampling per the policy protocols. This was especially true in inspections of products with multiple bills of lading and large numbers of specimens in single shipments. In these instances the inspectors were sampling at best half of the required boxes of fruit, vegetables, or herbs simply to keep up with their inspection schedules. The AQIM reports were then fudged to make it appear that the proper amount of samples had been taken and inspected. The practice violates policy and skews the sampling results.

A third example involves regulated products which are destined for unloading at other ports beyond the initial port of entry. Prior APHIS policy generally required that such products be inspected at the initial port of entry. CBP procedures now allow the products to be forwarded to the destination ports "in bond" and inspected at the arrival sites. This

"in bond" traffic was termed a black hole by agriculture staff at some of the major cargo ports I visited. Once waived through the initial port of entry, the products simply disappeared from view. I was told that this occurred occasionally on cargo aircraft because the flights from the entry to the destination port were domestic in character and not subject to scrutiny on the ATS or ACS systems by specialists in advanced targeting or manifest review units at destination ports. The first indication of such traffic, or the need for an agricultural inspection, was a call from a broker informing CBP of the presence of the product. How many brokers failed to call CBP and request inspection was unknown.

Another example of a problem with regulated and miscellaneous cargo was the sheer volume of some shipments coming into the larger ports and the inability of agricultural specialists at the cargo examinations sites to inspect everything in a timely manner. In such instances the agricultural specialists in targeting were selecting only a few containers of a specific product, for example three containers of Italian tile from a shipment of twenty containers, to send for inspection and allowing the remaining containers of the same product to go through the port unimpeded. The specialists in targeting were told by their supervisors that they could not place holds on everything because of the disruption to the speedy flow of trade through the ports of entry. In this case the selection of which of the twenty containers to examine becomes a kind of guessing game.

Another change in procedure that has had an impact on the interplay between policy and the inspection process occurs in passenger operation at the airports. Prior to the transfer of function, Both APHIS PPQ officers and U.S. Customs inspectors stood at the choke points of airport terminals as the departing passengers left the carousels with their bags and declarations. Both would, in turn, review the declarations and subject the passengers to physical scrutiny and verbal questioning to see if they should be referred either to agriculture or customs secondary for intensive inspections. This procedure was abandoned by CBP. The reason given for the change to the agricultural staff was either a security concern or expediting the flow of passengers out the door. Now only a CBP officer stands at the choke points, examines the declarations, asks questions, and makes such referrals.

The more senior agricultural specialists at air terminals stated almost unanimously that this change in procedure has had a dramatic and deleterious impact on the quality of referrals to agriculture secondary. The passengers who mark their declarations in the affirmative or acknowledge verbally having food products or having been on a farm are referred. But the CBP officers at the choke points lack the knowledge, skill, and experience to make informed referrals based on country of origin, seasonality of fruits and vegetables, baggage profiling, and pest risk of those passengers who deliberately conceal prohibited items or who do not understand the written or oral questions. The statistics bear out their opinion. Both the number of interceptions and the ratio of interceptions to inspections have declined substantially at airports from prior years. In this regard, the number of reportable pest interceptions at air baggage has halved from 2002 and 2003 to 2005 and 2006, from 27,076 and 29,514 to 13,833 and 13,914.

This halving of interceptions occurred not only because of the quality of referrals, but also because of severe staffing shortages. According to the agricultural staff the optimum number of personnel at a busy terminal under present procedures was at least five personnel: a rover at the carousels to target and refer passengers; a second officer at secondary to examine the declarations, talk to passengers, and place baggage onto the x-ray belt; a third officer to man the x-ray machine; and a fourth and fifth officers to open and inspect the contents of baggage that is selected for inspection. A canine officer at the terminal was an added bonus. Yet, in many instances the agricultural staff at the airports has worked with two or three officers, sometimes even less. At times agricultural supervisors and even chiefs have lent a hand at the secondary stations because the few specialists on duty were being overwhelmed by passenger traffic. In such instances the agriculture inspectors lacked time for the staff to examine seized fruits and vegetables.

Even during less busy times, agricultural specialists were often ordered by some of their non-agricultural supervisors or chiefs to remain on the inspection floor and not allowed to return to their offices to examine seized fruits for insects. In both these instances contraband, once collected, was put into grinders at the end of a shift and ultimately discarded without looking for insects. While this practice did mitigate the specific risk of pest introduction, it also prevented any analysis of risk or the detection of previously unknown pathways. It also eliminated many thousands of pest interceptions.

The collection and examination of fruits and vegetables at land border stations has also been affected by a change in agency procedures at some ports. Under APHIS procedures receptacles for fruit and vegetables were placed at primary stations to allow passengers or pedestrians the opportunity to voluntarily discard such items at they entered the country. People with small amounts of fruit or vegetables would often use the receptacles instead of declaring the items or trying to conceal them. During the day agricultural inspectors would walk up to the receptacles, collect the fruit, and then examine the items for pests. Under CBP the receptacles have been removed at some ports and the volume of fruit and vegetables ultimately seized and examined by agricultural inspectors for pests and plant pathogens at these border stations substantially decreased.

Staffing shortages also have had an adverse impact upon the compliance inspections of aircraft. Under PPQ the agricultural officers at the terminals generally examined the planes themselves to ensure that cabins were properly cleaned, food stores removed, and garbage bagged and disposed of. At a number of the airports this inspection was not being done any more or done by one or two compliance specialists who were hard pressed to check all of the arriving planes. Aircraft inspections have dropped in half from a high of 524,010 in 2002 to a low of 212,993 in 2006.

It is noteworthy to add that only one of the airports I visited according to CBP agricultural staff had sufficient numbers of specialists to provide adequate coverage for all of their inspection duties. Most of the airports were operating with about half the staff of inspectors they said they needed to do a thorough job.

The seaports have been affected likewise by a change in routine procedures. The APHIS policy was to inspect high risk vessels the day of arrival, either during core hours or on overtime. If the ship carried the risk of fruit flies, the ship was boarded immediately upon arrival. The CBP agricultural specialists at one port I visited were boarding ships during regular shift hours always in the company of CBP officers, but rarely on overtime with them. The specialists were not allowed aboard incoming ships except in the company of CBP officers because of security concerns. If a vessel arrived after hours or on a weekend, it was boarded by CBP officers alone. The agricultural specialists inspected the ship the following day or on Monday, provided that it was still at that time in port. The specialists stated that such a practice was a safeguarding concern, since the ship's crew was free to leave the ship before the inspectors had a chance to inspect them and to check the vessel's stores and quarters for quarantine materials.

At the same port, the agriculture inspectors were also generally not inspecting passengers arriving on cruise ships because of lack of staff and overtime availability. The inspections were being done primarily by CBP officers. Ship inspections decreased in 2002 and 2003 from approximately 55,000 to 49,000 in 2004 and 2005. While such inspections have increased in 2006 to over 60,000, it is not clear if that figure represents inspections by agriculture specialists or includes those done by CBP officers when boarding and inspecting ships and passengers alone.

A broader and more troubling instance of the occasional disconnects between policy mandates and inspection practices and procedures involves the general inspection process itself. With one exception, every port I visited cited manpower constraints as the primary impediment to the successful completion of the AQI safeguarding mission. This was stressed for cargo, passenger, and express mail processing in spite of the fact that CBP has over the past two years successfully hired a large contingent of new agriculture specialists. The agency had not only equaled the numbers available at the time of the transfer of function in 2003, but had filled by last year all of the vacancies that existed at that time.

This apparent contradiction has occurred as a result of major changes in the way the work is now performed by CBP agricultural specialists, both organizationally and administratively. As mentioned above, the transfer of function shifted dramatically the work paradigm for the agriculture inspectors at the ports of entry. APHIS assigned the majority of its officers to conduct inspections either of passengers or cargo transiting through ports of entry. In the cargo arena the individual PPQ officers reviewed manifests, targeted shipments, inspected and cleared shipments, or held infested or diseased commodities for fumigation, re-export, or destruction. In the passenger arena, the PPQ officers and technicians worked by the carousels, at choke points, and in secondary stations screening and inspecting passengers for forbidden items. Both staffs generally worked eight hour shifts five days a week. Cargo shipments or passenger flights requiring inspection before or after the core eight hour shifts or on weekends were handled on overtime. APHIS managers and supervisors, with a broader port structure, drew upon a greater number of personnel to cover work assignments either during the day or night. The San Diego port, for instance, had officers assigned to the city airport, to the

seaport, and to land border stations in the surrounding area. Staff from one site could support staff at another site if necessary and the entire cadre of officers and technicians were on call for overtime assignments anywhere within the port.

In contrast, CBP has integrated the individual agricultural inspectors into many of its ancillary work units such as training, operations, selectivity, targeting, passenger analysis, and compliance units. The CBP inspection staff has also been assigned in many ports into overlapping or consecutive shifts. Some CBP ports covered the entire work week on three regular shifts, seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day. Other ports worked six days a week on different shifts to cover passenger and cargo traffic. CBP with its larger cadre of officers performing other duties has many more ports of entry. San Diego is one port; San Ysidro a second; and Otay Mesa a third. The separate agricultural staffs in the CBP model do not generally support each other in day to day operations.

While many of the changes noted above have had a positive impact, especially in the training of new officers, the review of manifest entries, and the electronic targeting of cargo shipments, the net effect is that the agricultural inspection workforce, previously concentrated during core hours and on overtime on the primary task of agriculture inspections, is now compartmentalized and diffused. Fewer specialists now do the actual work of inspecting, both in the airport terminals and at the cargo sites, and those that do the inspections are extremely hard pressed to cover all of the high risk pathways or, when work is busy, to perform quality inspections.

A second, administrative factor involves the sheer amount of record keeping incumbent upon agricultural specialists for both APHIS and CBP monitoring systems. APHIS requires data collection and entry for the Workload Accomplishment Data System (WADS), the 280 system, the Pest Information Network (PIN309), Agricultural Quarantine Inspection Monitoring (AQIM), and Emergency Action Notification (EAN) databases. CBP requires data collection and input into the Customs Officer Scheduling System (COSS), the Seized Asset and Case Tracking System (SEACATS), the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS), and Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) electronic systems.

The burden of data collection, data entry, record keeping, and record correction is extensive and has an adverse impact upon the inspection mission. Agricultural supervisors at a number of the ports stated quite frankly that they had little time to oversee the work of their subordinate inspection staff, but were overwhelmed with reporting and record keeping duties. Agricultural specialists at cargo sites said that they spent a good part of their inspection time simply stamping, initialing, and dating copy after copy of cargo manifests. The specialists at the airport terminals, likewise, spoke of the amount of time spent on inputting the results of each inspection into their computers.

As an example of this kind of problem, I interviewed agriculture staff at one port which was tasked with inspecting truck cargo as it crossed the border under the agency's new (ACE) system. The specialists and their supervisor stated that the cargo inspections were

severely compromised because of data entry requirements and the sluggishness of the electronic system. Three agriculture specialists were assigned to inspection duty over an eight hour shift with inspection responsibilities for all of the trucks crossing the border with regulated agricultural commodities. During the busier times of the shift, with sometimes more than a hundred trucks to check, two of the specialists spent all of their time inputting data into the ACE system and sealing the trucks. The third specialist rushed from bay to bay in the warehouse actually inspecting fruit and vegetable products. These inspections were quick and cursory glances into the backs of each truck, abbreviated tailgate looks, and then on to the next bay. According to the agricultural staff, at these times agricultural commodities were being released without adequate inspections.

Another example of problems with the electronic systems was the paperless entry of products. Both targeting and selectivity units stated that according to CBP procedures, manifest information must be provided by carriers at least forty-eight hours prior to arrival at ports of entries into the ACS system. However, importers or brokers had ten days upon arrival to place more detailed entry information into the ACS system. In some instances, the manifest information did not allow the targeting staff to recognize agricultural products or regulated materials and place the commodities on hold. This was especially true with consolidated shipments or with miscellaneous products using generic tariff codes. By the time the importer or broker provided more specific information into the entry data, some of the commodities had left the port without inspection.

Other reporting requirements are duplicative and hinder the inspection process. Specialists at the airports now fill out an APHIS penalty form as well as enter penalty information into the CBP SEACATS system in order to write a violation and impose a civil fine on a passenger who disobeys regulations. According to the agriculture inspectors, the APHIS paper process took about ten to fifteen minutes; the CBP electronic process required from a half an hour to one hour depending on the skill of the specialist with the system. Both are still mandated. Many specialists have stopped assessing penalties when they are busy or when they are short staffed. Violations at the terminals plummeted from 11,198 in 2003, to 5,165 in 2004, and 4,804 in 2005. In 2006 these violations have increased to 7,816; but this is more than 3,000 below the highpoint in 2003. Violations, in all categories, dropped from 23,985 to 13,482 between 2003 and 2006.

The failure to write penalties has an even wider impact since CBP is using the information input into SEACATS to identify and specifically target previous violators, something that APHIS was unable to do with its sole reliance on written documentation. Failure to assess the fine and input the information means the passenger is not targeted again or, if caught a second time, not liable to a larger fine.

## Communication and Coordination

Communications and coordination at the senior management and liaison levels in Washington, D.C., were praised by both CBP and APHIS staffs. Regular meetings between senior executives at the highest level, that of administrator and commissioner, or deputy administrator and assistant commissioner, have tended to increase understanding of issues and to resolve many major differences. The liaison staffs at headquarters offices were for the most part long standing colleagues who worked well together, if sometimes with strong differences of opinion about the root of problems between the two agencies.

Coordination between the two agencies in the field differed dramatically from port to port. All of the ports I visited had established pest risk committees as the primary vehicle for interagency coordination and cooperation. The committees generally included CBP port staff; various APHIS elements including representatives from the State Plant Health Director's office, Smuggling Interdiction and Trade Compliance, Investigations and Enforcement Services, and the Plant Inspection Station; and officials from the Food and Drug Administration, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and state agriculture agencies. The more proactive of the pest risk committees had formed subcommittees or delegated authority to subordinate staff with specific tasking to collaborate with other agencies - to meet regularly, share program information and intelligence, assess risk, identify vulnerable pathways, and utilize either blitzes or other kinds of operations to combat the accidental or deliberate entry of pests and plant diseases into our country. Other committees seemed content to provide an occasional forum for the members of individual agencies to meet and greet with little of consequence to follow by way of real collaboration.

The effect of the more active pest committees was evident in talking with APHIS field staff in SITC, IES, and PIS. Where the committees were actively engaged, the APHIS staffs were in regular contact with CBP agricultural liaisons, chiefs, and supervisors; had access to the CBP ports; and could work together in a variety of ways. With less active committees there were still barriers to both communication and cooperation. The key was leadership in both agencies, with CBP at port and field office levels and with APHIS in the state and local offices, and the willingness of staff at lower levels of both agencies to cooperate with each other.

Communication and coordination between CBP Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) staff at the ports of entry and PPQ's Plant Inspection Station personnel were generally good. Interceptions were quickly transported to the identifiers as was information about the arrival of viable plants requiring inspection and cargo needing fumigation. Most of the identifiers stated that although interceptions had dropped off in 2004 and 2005 the numbers were now rebounding. One of the plant inspection stations I visited had a very large backlog of routine interceptions which the identifier said would never get identified because of the press of other work. Such a situation serves as a cogent argument for discard authority for CBP agricultural specialists.

Many of the ports I visited also received regular monthly reports from the identifiers at the plant inspection stations which highlighted the port's recent interception results, provided pictures and descriptions of rare pests, and singled out individual officers for praise. The reports, when provided to the agricultural specialists, were welcomed since they showed the inspectors the results of their interceptions and highlighted individual accomplishments. Communication and coordination between the CBP ports of entry and APHIS veterinarians were also good with the exception of one port where the CBP liaison, a former PPQ supervisor, and the APHIS veterinary regulatory officer had, according to staff of both agencies, a history of conflict.

Coordination in the joint evaluation teams has improved with time. The initial port reviews by CBP and APHIS staff left personnel from both agencies with grave doubts about the effectiveness of evaluation process. APHIS officials were unhappy with the process itself, with limited access to port personnel and data and the lack of an effective procedure by which deficiencies would be addressed. CBP officials and port staff in turn were concerned with excessive fault finding, with the tendency of some APHIS team members to indulge primarily in criticism of the new agency, especially of flaws and faults that had historically plagued AQI. The process has been amended to incorporate best practices as well as deficiencies into the review report, while the ports are being provided a list of items for remedial attention. The evaluations will never be without some degree of tension; for no agency appreciates an outside party looking over its shoulder, whether it is APHIS personnel or a congressional investigator. I attended the entry and closing conferences for the joint review in San Francisco, both of which were carried out in a professional manner by staff from both agencies. CBP agricultural supervisors and specialists in the field stated that the joint reviews and subsequent recommendations have been keys in resolving various concerns and issues at their ports of entry.

Coordination and communication with respect to the canine teams was and still is problematic. There were major differences in training, in the daily care and handling of the animals, and in annual testing by APHIS and CBP staffs. Agricultural handlers and their dogs are initially trained at the APHIS facility in Orlando, Florida; CBP officers and their dogs are trained at the CBP facility in Front Royal, Virginia. The training procedures are not the same. Most of APHIS' dogs are of a smaller breed, a beagle; while CBP's are of larger breeds, German shepherds or Labrador retrievers. The APHIS beagle is trained to respond passively to five initial food odors by sitting down; the CBP's shepherds are taught to react to either drugs or to explosives actively by pawing.

The beagle has also been traditionally trained by APHIS in the field to expand its range of scents to as many as one hundred individual odors. The shepherd is restricted to the limited number of scents that it learns at the CBP academy. The beagle, when successful, is rewarded by being given treats; the shepherd is rewarded by playing tug of war with a towel. Canine staff under APHIS policy was able to buy many different kinds of treats for their animals; under CBP the staff was usually restricted to one treat when money was

available. The APHIS agricultural staff could provide blankets as bedding for the beagles; while CBP procedures did not allow them.

Training in the field differed too. CBP mandates that the dog be trained each day before beginning to work by identifying one or more of the basic scents hidden by handlers in objects on the carousels. Some of the agriculture handlers stated that this practice, when mandated for the agricultural animals, taught the dog only to look for easy targets and to avoid more difficult odors. CBP also forbade the agricultural handlers from training their dogs on products that had been seized, which was a standard practice under APHIS. Since the seized products, usually exotic fruit and meats, are not available in the marketplace, training on such odors is impossible and the dog gradually loses the ability to detect such contraband.

Most importantly, the APHIS animal is treated as a work partner; the CBP animal as a work tool. The relationship between the agricultural handler and dog is consequently much gentler and more caring among the APHIS staff. The dog handler under APHIS had ready access to veterinarians for the care of the animal in the event of sickness or disease. No administrative process stood in the way of immediate care. In CBP, the handler has to seek approvals, both from canine supervisors and administrative staff, before such care was provided. According to agricultural staff, many of the approvals were hard to get and sometimes untimely. The dogs under APHIS were kenneled in quarters that were generally more expensive and better equipped; when moved into CBP kennels the accommodations became more Spartan, one even lacking in heat for the animals.

Relations between handlers and dogs as a consequence of these factors were quite different and the differences have played havoc in the field. Many of the canine handlers were affronted by the attitude of CBP toward the animals. Many felt the imposition of CBP procedures was done with little concern for the effects on the dogs themselves or on the performance of the agricultural mission. As a consequence, many handlers either left the agency or gave up their dogs. At the onset of the merger APHIS had about one hundred and fifteen canine teams at ports of entry to detect prohibited items in both passenger and cargo areas. That number dropped last year to about eighty-five in CBP. Agricultural inspectors in the field praised the canine teams and their ability to detect concealed fruit, vegetable, and meat products and stated that the reduction in teams at the ports of entry has been a serious handicap to the performance of their safeguarding mission.

One initial problem area in coordination and cooperation has been CBP's participation in emergency response teams to combat domestic pest infestations or plant diseases. Although agreed to by both parties, CBP was unable in 2004, 2005, and 2006 to provide APHIS with substantial numbers of port personnel to assist in these emergency details. The reason for the lack of participation was their shortage of staff in the field. More recently, with an increase in staffing CBP has been providing port personnel in response to such requests for assistance.

One noteworthy success has been in training. All of the specialists I spoke with praised the new officer training at the Professional Development Center, both the quality of the instruction and the competence of the instructors. They felt that they were given a basic foundation in APHIS' entomology and manual sections and a good introduction to CBP's organization and mission, all of which prepared them to do their job in the field. The training staff praised the quality of students coming in to the academy, their high grade point average and low dropout rate. Most of the senior agricultural staff in the field also complimented the newly trained specialists, their willingness to work and their dedication to the agricultural mission.

Minor quibbles about the training curriculum in Frederick involved the lack of orientation on CBP's basic computer systems and the lack of instruction in how to find the bugs in the field that they were being asked to identify at the academy. The specialists also stated that the center needed to use on-line manuals for instruction, not paper copies, since that was the standard mode of access at the ports of entry. It also needed to provide better pest specimens especially for the older students with less keen vision who had considerable difficulty examining the present specimens.

The on the job training provided both pre-academy and post-academy by CBP staff at the ports of entry was also generally praised by staff. The most effective of the ports had full time agricultural coordinators who carefully monitored training time and schedules and supervised the trainees' shadowing activities. Some of the ports included a day or two of training at the plant inspection stations to acquaint the specialists with the work of the entomologists, botanists, and safeguarding officers. At some ports the identifiers had conducted classes to assist the specialists in identifying and finding pests and plant pathogens in the field. The veterinary regulatory officers had also conducted classes at the ports on the risks of avian influenza and bovine spongiform encephalitis to assist the staff in properly regulating meat products.

## Performance and Financial Data Analysis

The annual WADS data can be broken down by general categories (Exhibit 1) and by specific pathways (Exhibit 2). In comparing the last year of work under APHIS' system, fiscal year 2003, with the last year of work under CBP's structure, fiscal year 2006, the positive performance changes were: 1) 62% increase in regulated cargo clearances from 458,919 to 747,757; 2) 26% increase in railcar inspections from 507,548 to 643,524; 3) 12% increase in regulated cargo inspections from 606,055 to 678,655; 4) 9% increase in ship inspections from 55,170 to 60,152; and 5) 8% increase in the interception of cargo pests from 29,068 to 31,307.

The negative changes between these two years were: 1) 73% decrease in miscellaneous cargo clearances from 2,043,426 to 552,221; 2) 57% decrease in the inspection of aircraft from 504,796 to 212,993; 3) 43% decrease in the issuance of violations from 23,985 to 13,482; 4) 25% decrease in the interception of all pests from 72,845 to 54,444; 5) 21% decrease in the interception of plant materials from 1,325,318 to 1,043,657; 6) 16% decrease in the inspection of miscellaneous cargo from 595,750 to 498,135; 7) 13%

decrease in air passenger inspections from 9,812,742 to 8,469,472; and 8) 11% decrease in animal product interceptions from 408,011 to 361,131.

The general trend downward in the interception of quarantine materials - animal products, plant pathogens, and pests - supports the agricultural specialists' remarks about the lack of adequate time and personnel to cover major pathways and perform quality inspections.

The financial data also illustrates differences between APHIS and CBP. APHIS uses a standard object class accounting system for determining costs. It also keeps track of costs by source, either appropriated funds, user fees, or reimbursables. CBP uses an offset, activity based, costing system that measures costs by time, resource, and activity. It does not track costs by budgetary source.

According to CBP financial staff, the total user fee cost of the agricultural inspection program was $222,520,533 in 2004; $222,408,076 in 2005; and $241,322,480 in 2006 (Exhibit 3). According to the staff, the 2006 figure represented 5,414,712 hours spent by CBP staff on agricultural functions, which was six percent of a total of 90,181,570 hours spent on all CBP activities. Of the 5,414,712 agricultural hours, 3,550,423 hours were worked by agricultural specialists, or 65.5% of the total hours. The remaining 1,864,289 in agricultural hours, or 34.5% of the total hours, were worked by technicians, officers, managers, and administrative support staff. According to the CBP financial staff agricultural specialists invested 78% of their time on agricultural duties and 22% of their time on other CBP related duties.

Attached as Exhibit 4 is a schedule which analyzes user fee costs and performance results for quarantine material interceptions, cargo inspections and clearances, and passenger inspections over the past three years. Between 2004 and 2006 the costs per each interception has gone up fifteen percent, the cost per each cargo inspection and clearance up twenty-six percent, and the cost per each air passenger inspection up forty-seven percent. Overall, costs have increased while performance results have dropped. The decrease in the number of air passenger inspections was significant, from 11,758,331 to 8,469,472, almost twenty-eight percent.

## Agricultural Specialist Comments and Recommendations

All of the agricultural specialists I interviewed at the ports of entry were asked to provide the positives and the negatives effects of the transfer of function upon the performance of the agricultural mission with respect to policy, personnel, and operating procedures. They were also asked what, if anything, they would change to improve the agriculture safeguarding mission at their ports of entry.

The most commonly cited positives were: 1) CBP's promotion of specialists and technicians to higher journeyman grades, GS-11 and GS-7 respectively; 2) the incorporation of a portion of their overtime into retirement calculations; 3) the employment of electronic information systems in administrative and programmatic areas,

specifically COS and ACS, ATS and SEACATS; 4) better use of the latter electronic systems in targeting cargo and passenger traffic; 5) stricter accountability and discipline in conduct and performance; 6) better understanding of customs and immigration duties; and 7) a closer working relationship with their CBP peers, especially with the younger officers.

The most common negatives were: 1) the devaluation of the agricultural mission, its subordination to other agency priorities, i.e. the search for terrorists and weapons of mass destruction, the detection of illegal aliens, and the seizure of illegal drugs and other traditional customs contraband; 2) ) the lack of adequate numbers of agricultural staff to properly perform their mission; 3) ) the absence of agricultural representation in positions of managerial authority; 4) the lack of budgetary resources to sufficiently fund staffing and overtime, repair or replace broken equipment, and provide routine supplies; and 5) the lack of a career ladder in the field in the agricultural area beyond the GS-12 and the GS-13 levels.

The specialists were also asked what single change either in policy or procedure would most enhance the performance of their safeguarding work. The most common recommendation was to place agriculture managers in position of line authority at ports of entry. According to the specialists, an assistant port director or program manager for agriculture would give their specialty a voice in decision making and provide an opportunity for advancement for the cadre of agricultural personnel beyond supervisor and chief positions into management ranks. It would also provide a mechanism for feedback from subordinate staff to senior port managers which the specialists felt was sorely lacking now.

They also recommended filling open agricultural supervisory and chief positions much more quickly with agricultural personnel. While the agriculture staff praised some of their legacy customs and immigration supervisors and chiefs, they stated that the agricultural inspections needed technically trained first and second line supervisors who were familiar with the science that stood behind the work, knowledgeable of the regulations that governed it, and aware of the risks for American agriculture should quarantine safeguards fail. They also wanted supervisors and chiefs who were willing to speak up on agricultural issues, not serve by sitting passively or silent when there were problems to be resolved with higher management.

They sought, not surprisingly, considerably more agriculture specialists and technicians to help with inspections. According to the field staff, the CBP structure requires more inspectors and technicians in the terminals and at the cargo examination sites for the agricultural staff to perform quality work. Additional technicians could handle data input and other administrative tasks at air terminals and in cargo facilities which would release specialists to concentrate more fully on inspection duties.

The field staff asked for more professional opportunities for agriculture specialists, both within and outside of their immediate ports, such as assignments overseas, details to other ports, and broader training. If this required arming those agriculture specialists willing to

carry guns, they argued for such a measure. According to many of the younger specialists, the gun serves now as a symbol of the differences in status between the CBP officer and agriculture specialist. It disqualifies the specialist from various assignments such as boarding ships unescorted, working with tactical units at the terminals, serving on radiation portal monitor teams, or going overseas or on special temporary duty assignments. It also denies the specialists the opportunity to compete on a more equal basis with CBPO's for promotions into the supervisor and chief grades outside of the agricultural field.

Within ports, the agricultural staff recommended that the senior cadre of agricultural personnel, the chiefs, supervisors, and senior specialists from the various work units, be allowed to meet once or twice a month to share information and discuss common problems. For instance, many of the agricultural staff in targeting and manifest review units said that they lacked knowledge of the results of their holds and such knowledge was crucial to the success of their work. Most of the staff felt that the individual units were too isolated and there was a real need for an occasional forum to discuss the coordination of their duties and how well the overall AQI work was being done.

Field inspectors also sought discard authority for routine pests. They felt that this authority would restore one of the scientific aspects of the work that was promised at employment, cited at the training academy, but missing from the actual job. It also would relieve the APHIS identifiers of backlogs of routine interceptions, allow them more time to spend on significant pests and plant specimens, and attend to additional duties with emergency or domestic units.

Many agricultural specialists asked for the agency to return to some form of annual duty rotations. Many of the agriculture staff, both in cargo and passenger processing, resented being typecast with little or no prospect for a change in duties. They felt that annual rotations through various job assignments made for a well rounded officer, prevented burnout, and dramatically improved morale.

Finally, many legacy agricultural staff and even newly hired specialists in CBP voiced concern during the interviews about the turnover ratio among their inspection staff. Not a few said that they, too, were now looking for other jobs. They stated quite forcefully that the agency needed to make changes on behalf of agriculture if it wanted to keep its better people in house and not become an annual incubator of talent for other agencies.

## Praiseworthy Practices

In conclusion, I would like to single out CBP agricultural staff at various ports whom I thought were especially proactive on behalf of the agricultural safeguarding mission: the CBP air cargo and express mail operations in Miami; the CBP training unit in New York; the CBP canine teams in San Francisco and Oakland; the CBP advanced targeting unit and pest risk committees in Long Beach; and the CBP land border inspection station detail at San Ysidro. I was also quite impressed with the work that the APHIS PPQ identifiers were doing at the majority of plant inspection stations at the ports I visited in

not only identifying pest and plant materials, but also providing statistical results, illustrative pictures, and other descriptive materials that were very informative and quite supportive of the work of the CBP agricultural specialists at the ports of entry I visited.

WADS DATA SUMMARY COMPARISON 2000 - 2006
All CBP Ports

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Ships Inspected 2000 | 52,375 |
| Total Ships Inspected 2001 | 52,016 |
| Total Ships Inspected 2002 | 55,926 |
| Total Ships Inspected 2003 | 55,170 |
| Total Ship Inspections 2004 | 48,696 |
| Total Ships Inspected 2005 | 49,463 |
| Total Ships Inspected 2006 | 60,152 |
| | |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2000 | 395,187 |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2001 | 436,697 |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2002 | 524,010 |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2003 | 504,796 |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2004 | 504,065 |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2005 | 347,470 |
| Total Aircraft Inspected 2006 | 212,993 |
| | |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2000 | 398,537 |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2001 | 456,158 |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2002 | 495,686 |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2003 | 507,548 |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2004 | 589,442 |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2005 | 591,191 |
| Total Railcars Inspected 2006 | 643,524 |
| | |
| Total Conveyances 2000 | 846,099 |
| Total Conveyances 2001 | 944,871 |
| Total Conveyances 2002 | 1,075,622 |
| Total Conveyances 2003 | 1,043,590 |
| Total Conveyances 2004 | 1,142,203 |
| Total Conveyances 2005 | 988,124 |
| Total Conveyances 2006 | 917,022 |
| | |
| Total Reportable Pests 2000 | 55,160 |
| Total Reportable Pests 2001 | 54,080 |
| Total Reportable Pests 2002 | 72,963 |
| Total Reportable Pests 2003 | 72,845 |
| Total Reportable Pests 2004 | 58,522 |
| Total Reportable Pests 2005 | 54,749 |
| Total Reportable Pests 2006 | 54,444 |
| | |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2000 | 22,613 |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2001 | 25,019 |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2002 | 27,747 |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2003 | 29,068 |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2004 | 28,357 |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2005 | 30,693 |
| Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2006 | 31,307 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 1 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY COMPARISON 2000 - 2006
All CBP Ports

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2000 | 445,678 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2001 | 411,841 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2002 | 443,072 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2003 | 458,919 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2004 | 526,193 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2005 | 663,356 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2006 | 747,757 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2000 | 513,328 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2001 | 500,292 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2002 | 545,571 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2003 | 606,055 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2004 | 653,959 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2005 | 697,043 |
| Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2006 | 678,655 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2000 | 982,844 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2001 | 816,820 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2002 | 1,327,777 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2003 | 2,043,426 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2004 | 1,160,343 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2005 | 694,225 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2006 | 552,221 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2000 | 258,468 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2001 | 339,526 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2002 | 428,110 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2003 | 595,750 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2004 | 459,657 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2005 | 483,690 |
| Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2006 | 498,135 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Violations Issued 2000 | 21,465 |
| Total Violations Issued 2001 | 17,374 |
| Total Violations Issued 2002 | 17,368 |
| Total Violations Issued 2003 | 23,985 |
| Total Violations Issued 2004 | 15,957 |
| Total Violations Issued 2005 | 9,026 |
| Total Violations Issued 2006 | 13,482 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2000 | 1,475,028 |
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2001 | 1,464,072 |
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2002 | 1,344,361 |
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2003 | 1,325,318 |
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2004 | 1,061,246 |
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2005 | 1,139,160 |
| Total Plant Material Interceptions 2006 | 1,043,657 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 2 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY COMPARISON 2000 - 2006
All CBP Ports

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Passengers Inspected 2000 | 26,257,805 |
| Total Passengers Inspected 2001 | 30,825,013 |
| Total Passengers Inspected 2002 | 31,490,229 |
| Total Passengers Inspected 2003 | 27,110,179 |
| Total Passengers Inspected 2004 | 32,852,211 |
| Total Passengers Inspected 2005 | 30,596,721 |
| Total Passengers Inspected 2006 | 25,413,082 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2000 | 332,370 |
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2001 | 332,447 |
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2002 | 351,151 |
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2003 | 408,011 |
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2004 | 434,094 |
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2005 | 388,889 |
| Total Animal Product Interceptions 2006 | 361,131 |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2000
All USDA Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 22946 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 4150 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 3246 |
| 2003 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Foreign | 19261 |
| 2004 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Coastwise | 2119 |
| 2005 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Other | 653 |
| | **Total Ships Inspected 2000** | **52375** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 246062 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 25664 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 19385 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 3912 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 62711 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 28526 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 8927 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspected 2000** | **395187** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 360865 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 37672 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected 2000** | **398537** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest | 1443 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pests | 6 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage | 150 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo | 3902 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 1302 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage | 18846 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo | 13860 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 1890 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 1541 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 7351 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 3025 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 909 |
| 1081E | QMIs, Reportable Pest From Railcar | 538 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo | 383 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 14 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2000** | **55160** |
| | **Total Reportable Cargo Pests 2000** | **22613** |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances | 105896 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances | 63888 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 175913 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances | 4273 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances | 33302 |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance | 62406 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2000** | **445678** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections | 69953 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections | 141637 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated | 40 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 4 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2000
All USDA Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 99542 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections | 5160 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspectio | 282 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections | 153131 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect | 43583 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections** | **513328** |
| | | |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance | 105281 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances | 280466 |
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 396692 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances | 1217 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances | 197510 |
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance | 1678 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances** | **982844** |
| | | |
| 2009 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 37 |
| 2068 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 157 |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect | 101793 |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections | 86234 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 24652 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous | 372 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 24439 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections | 17828 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 2956 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections** | **258468** |
| | | |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 11170 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 1364 |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 46 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 4455 |
| 1138 | Violations | 3545 |
| 1178 | Violations | 2 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 195 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 87 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo | 96 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 | 270 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 | 61 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 | 147 |
| 1070A | Violations, Notification | 4 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo | 23 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2000** | **21465** |
| | | |
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 695967 |
| 1076 | QMIs, Plant, Coop | 30835 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 5252 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 9 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 34519 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 907 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 11641 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 215687 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 4042 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 190560 |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2000
All USDA Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 61392 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1125 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 32798 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 1211 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 189083 |
| | **Total Plant Material Interceptions 2000** | **1475028** |
| | | |
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections | 8520507 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 2678580 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 8317648 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 2228083 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger | 462657 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 437725 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 3224630 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew | 133195 |
| 2007A | O/T Passenger/Crew Count | 322 |
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 139 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 254319 |
| | **Total Passenger Inspections 2000** | **26257805** |
| | | |
| 1077 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Coop | 1460 |
| 1079 | QMIs, Animal Prod/Byprod, Coop, Other | 134 |
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 5957 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 1304 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 1682 |
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 2 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 3333.56 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 25 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 2 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 11 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 197799.5 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 41091 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 1654 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 9311 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 140 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 288 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 39153 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 6203 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 195 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 5393 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 2760 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 3019 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 208 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 72 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 703 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 5214 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 2236 |
| | **Total Animal Product Interceptions 2000** | **332370** |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 6 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2001
All USDA Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 22956 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 4186 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 3343 |
| 2003 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Foreign | 18244 |
| 2004 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Coastwise | 2552 |
| 2005 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Other | 735 |
| | **Total Ships Inspected 2001** | **52016** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 258399 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 25997 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 19617 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 28718 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 63883 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 29262 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 10821 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspections 2001** | **436697** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 409034 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 47124 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected 2001** | **456158** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest | 1870 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pests | 98 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage | 109 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo | 4625 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 1336 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage | 17509 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo | 14340 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 1117 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 1000 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 6922 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 3122 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 968 |
| 1081E | QMIs, Reportable Pest From Railcar | 256 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo | 806 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 2 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2001** | **54080** |
| | **Total Reportable Cargo Pests 2001** | **25019** |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance | 53704 |
| 1170 | Clearances | 14514 |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances | 88520 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances | 79615 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 143022 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances | 6432 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances | 26034 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2001** | **411841** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections | 68817 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections | 144608 |
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 92014 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated | 2469 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections | 6729 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspectio | 1046 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections | 140127 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect | 44482 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2001** | **500292** |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance | 119220 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances | 505918 |
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 34520 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances | 749 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances | 155070 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 7 OF 25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance | 1343 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2001** | **816820** |
| 2009 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 54 |
| 2068 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 149 |
| 2093 | O/T Inspections, Misc Cargo, Airport | 1 |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections | 126799 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 28884 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous | 4860 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections | 25481 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 23955 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 1992 |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect | 127351 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2001** | **339526** |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 24 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 18 |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 10282 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 4655 |
| 1138 | Violations | 1537 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 185 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 95 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo | 81 |
| 1178 | Violations | 5 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 | 141 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 | 111 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 | 200 |
| 1070A | Violations, Notification | 9 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo | 31 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2001** | **17374** |
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 677452 |
| 1076 | QMIs, Plant, Coop | 33376 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 7526 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 40 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 47028 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 255 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 8560 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 200705 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 4227 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 196160 |
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 57095 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1238 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 31854 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 659 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 197897 |
| | **Total Plant Material Interceptions 2001** | **1464072** |
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections | 10189076 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 3483807 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 8486975 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 2504726 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger | 543747 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 439778 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 3563004 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew | 217574 |
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 1115288 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 281038 |
| | **Total Passengers Inspected 2001** | **30825013** |
| 1077 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Coop | 2339 |
| 1079 | QMIs, Animal Prod/Byprod, Coop, Other | 496 |
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 8686 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 312 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 312 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 8 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2001
All USDA Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 47 |
| 1175 | QMIs, Other Animal | 4 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 4443 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 150 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 7 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 155 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 200496 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 40968 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 2353 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 7871 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 113 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 551 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 37394 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 5697 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 193 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 5478 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 2702 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 2878 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 87 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 43 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 114 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 3022 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 5521 |
| 1099C | QMIs, Inedible Animal | 15 |
| | **Total Animal Products Interceptions 2001** | **332447** |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 9 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2002
All USDA Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 23904 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 4655 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 3867 |
| 2003 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Foreign | 19218 |
| 2004 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Coastwise | 3485 |
| 2005 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Other | 797 |
| | **Total Ships Inspected 2002** | **55926** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 223495 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 38907 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 24184 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 139009 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 66827 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 21095 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 10493 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspected 2002** | **524010** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 456288 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 39398 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected** | **495686** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest | 669 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pests | 81 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage | 111 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo | 6080 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 1616 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage | 27076 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo | 14109 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 1707 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 3632 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 9162 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 6032 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 1229 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo | 1008 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs | 14 |
| 1081E | QMIs, Reportable Pest From Railcar | 437 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2002** | **72963** |
| | **Total Reportable Cargo Pests 2002** | **27747** |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances | 91311 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances | 103822 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 160000 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances | 5881 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances | 24520 |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance | 57538 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2002** | **443072** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections | 73668 |
| 1008C | (Regular Time) Inspections- Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 929 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections | 177907 |
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 94618 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated | 5255 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections | 10596 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 32 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections | 133516 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect | 49050 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2002** | **545571** |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance | 147272 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances | 339890 |
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 456789 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances | 1695 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances | 379956 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 10 OF 25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance | 2175 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2002** | **1327777** |
| 2009 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 5 |
| 2068 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 134 |
| 2093 | O/T Inspections, Misc Cargo, Airport | 1579 |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect | 143512 |
| 1009C | (Regular Time) Inspections Misc Cargo (Container Inspection) | 736 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 39530 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous | 7575 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 25202 |
| 2009C | O/T Inspections -Misc. Cargo (Container Inspection) | 55 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections | 42413 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 3703 |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections | 163666 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2002** | **428110** |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 43 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 1771 |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 8722 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 4100 |
| 1138 | Violations | 1375 |
| 1178 | Violations | 4 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 253 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 83 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo | 31 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 | 154 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 | 142 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 | 307 |
| 1070A | Violations, Notification | 268 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo | 115 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2002** | **17368** |
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 548151 |
| 1076 | QMIs, Plant, Coop | 36291 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 7855 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 80 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 44257 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 530 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 9404 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 170954 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 3218 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 251784 |
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 49713 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1253 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 34534 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 318 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 186019 |
| | **Total Plant Interceptions 2002** | **1344361** |
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections | 8399785 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 5068122 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 8379897 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 2121370 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger | 952129 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 508506 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 2971087 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew | 517571 |
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 1839439 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 214752 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew | 517571 |
| | **Total Passenger Inspections 2002** | **31490229** |
| 1077 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Coop | 1907 |
| 1079 | QMIs, Animal Prod/Byprod, Coop, Other | 258 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 11 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2002
All USDA Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 24348 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 1735 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 5416 |
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 42 |
| 1175 | QMIs, Other Animal | 5 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 2127 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 134 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 1 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 721 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 195100 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 34232 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 4621 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 4506 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 117 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 638 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 47142 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 6685 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 61 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 4689 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 827 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 4259 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 108 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 22 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 60 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 732 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 9510 |
| 1099C | QMIs, Inedible Animal | 1148 |
| | **Total Animal Product Interceptions 2002** | **351151** |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2003
All CBP Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 21648 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 3380 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 6218 |
| 2003 | O/T Ship Inspections, Foreign | 20135 |
| 2004 | O/T Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 3007 |
| 2005 | O/T Ship Inspections, Other | 782 |
| | **Total Ships Inspected 2003** | **55170** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 210090 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 43436 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 28254 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 134729 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 54632 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 18228 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 15427 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspected 2003** | **504796** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 460144 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 47314 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected 2003** | **507548** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest - Mail | 772 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pests - Inland Inspection | 87 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage - Maritime | 189 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - Maritime | 5275 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Maritime | 1254 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage - Air | 29514 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo - Air | 15521 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Air | 1517 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 2119 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 7152 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 5979 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 1248 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - PreClearance | 2206 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - PreClearance | 12 |
| 1136A | Express Mail Reportable Pest | 0 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2003** | **72845** |
| | **Total Reportable Pests in Cargo 2003** | **29068** |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances - Maritime | 92511 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances - Air | 100768 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 179814 |
| 1067C | Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 185 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances - Maritime | 4329 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances - Air | 24319 |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance - Truck | 56993 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2003** | **458919** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections - Maritime | 80221 |
| 1008C | (Regular Time) Inspections- Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) - Maritime | 15859 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections - Air | 214752 |
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 107036 |
| 1067D | Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 156 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections - Maritime | 13319 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) - Maritime | 1239 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections - Air | 125771 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect - Truck | 42726 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated - Inland Inspection | 4976 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2003** | **606055** |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance - Maritime | 174935 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances - Air | 348470 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 912912 |
| 1068C | Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 68285 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances - Maritime | 925 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances - Air | 527657 |
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance - Truck | 2186 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous - Inland Inspection | 8056 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2003** | **2043426** |
| | | |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect - Maritime | 146780 |
| 1009C | (Regular Time) Inspections Misc Cargo (Container Inspection) - Maritime | 30724 |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections - Air | 155961 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 186094 |
| 1068D | Inspections - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 10 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections - Maritime | 18522 |
| 2009C | O/T Inspections -Misc. Cargo (Container Inspection) - Maritime | 1674 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections - Air | 48000 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect - Truck | 7985 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2003** | **595750** |
| | | |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew - Maritime | 27 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 9 |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew - Air | 11198 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 4119 |
| 1104 | Violations, Passenger/Crew - PreClearance | 0 |
| 1138 | Violations - Mail | 5040 |
| 1178 | Violations - Inland Inspection Cargo | 25 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 122 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 62 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo - Maritime | 641 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 - Air | 195 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 - Air | 63 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 - Air | 519 |
| 1070A | Violations, Notification - Land Border | 1817 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo - Land Border | 148 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2003** | **23985** |
| | | |
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 564923 |
| 1076 | QMIs, Plant, Coop | 21896 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 11719 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 195 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 33950 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 758 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 8297 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 145050 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 5393 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 239722 |
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 47322 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1784 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 35804 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 103 |
| 1071F | Plant QMIs, Passenger Train | 94 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 208057 |
| 1131A | Express Mail Plant Material Interception | 251 |
| | **Total Plant Interceptions 2005** | **1325318** |
| | | |
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections - Air | 7617620 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 3598525 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 8063274 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections - Air | 2195122 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger - Land Border | 611073 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 649036 |
| 1007B | Arriving Passenger/Crew, Inspections - Maritime | 421166 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 3017319 |
| 1063B | Actual Passengers From Train, inspected | 1526 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew - PreClearance | 491342 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections - Maritime | 279644 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 164532 |
| | **Total Passengers Inspected 2003** | **27110179** |
| | | |
| 1077 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Coop | 11270 |
| 1079 | QMIs, Animal Prod/Byprod, Coop, Other | 1422 |
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 29006 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 1202 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 1561 |
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 26 |
| 1175 | QMIs, Other Animal | 18 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 1785 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 134 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 2 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 11 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 200990 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 30617 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 7266 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 5292 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 206 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 2786 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 78272 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 6351 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 114 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 6685 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 49 |
| 1072F | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pax Train | 1 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 8336 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 662 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 97 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 1191 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 32 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 11403 |
| 1099C | QMIs, Inedible Animal | 43 |
| 1132A | Express Mail Meat/Poultry Interceptions | 1181 |
| 1134A | Express Mail Other Animal Products | 0 |
| | **Total Animal Product Interceptions 2003** | **408011** |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2004
CBP All Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 23859 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 3390 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 7223 |
| 2003 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Foreign | 12293 |
| 2004 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Coastwise | 1522 |
| 2005 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Other | 409 |
| | **Total Ship Inspections 2004** | **48696** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 230281 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 47526 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 24624 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 80135 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 50809 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 10801 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 59889 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspections 2004** | **504065** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 534039 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 55403 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected 2004** | **589442** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest - Mail | 768 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pests - Inland Inspections | 132 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage - Maritime | 157 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - Maritime | 4374 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Maritime | 635 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage - Air | 19581 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo - Air | 16958 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Air | 1266 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 927 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 5860 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 6441 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 963 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - PreClearance | 452 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Preclearance | 8 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2004** | **58522** |
| | **Total Reportable Pests Cargo 2004** | **28357** |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances - Maritime | 102238 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances - Air | 98010 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 245802 |
| 1067C | Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 5357 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances - Maritime | 5999 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances - Air | 12089 |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance - Truck | 56677 |
| 2067C | O/T Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 21 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances** | **526193** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections | 83087 |
| 1008C | (Regular Time) Inspections- Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 64775 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections | 212215 |
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 146998 |
| 1067D | Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 271 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated | 4479 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections | 7443 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 4163 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections | 86620 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect | 43894 |
| 2067D | O/T Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 14 |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2004
CBP All Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2004** | **653959** |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance | 166325 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances | 508386 |
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 340352 |
| 1068C | Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 27128 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances | 1154 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances | 100241 |
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance | 11881 |
| 2068C | O/T Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 4876 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2004** | **1160343** |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect | 147547 |
| 1009C | (Regular Time) Inspections Misc Cargo (Container Inspection) | 71300 |
| 2009 | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 43 |
| 2093 | O/T Inspections, Misc Cargo, Airport | 3089 |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections | 127913 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 60471 |
| 1068D | Inspections - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 1903 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous | 7843 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections | 3931 |
| 2009C | O/T Inspections -Misc. Cargo (Container Inspection) | 1429 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections | 20958 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect | 13222 |
| 2068D | O/T Inspection - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 8 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2004** | **459657** |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew - Maritime | 17 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 5 |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew - Air | 5165 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 2290 |
| 1104 | Violations, Passenger/Crew - PreClearance | 0 |
| 1138 | Violations - Mail | 7485 |
| 1178 | Violations - Inland Inspections Cargo | 16 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 131 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 18 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo - Maritime | 100 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 - Air | 168 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 - Air | 27 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 - Air | 329 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo - Land Border | 133 |
| 1138A | Express Mail Violations | 73 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2004** | **15957** |
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 552318 |
| 1076 | QMIs, Plant, Coop | 270 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 11793 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 157 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 20909 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 445 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 5350 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 94376 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 4998 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 243973 |
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 66623 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1098 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 38856 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 162 |
| 1071F | Plant QMIs, Passenger Train | 31 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 95417 |
| 1131A | Express Mail Plant Material Interception | 2384 |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2004
CBP All Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Total Plant Interceptions 2004** | **1139160** |
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections - Air | 9730278 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 3501333 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 11676082 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections - Air | 2028053 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger - Land Border | 521173 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 663248 |
| 1007B | Arriving Passenger/Crew, Inspections - Maritime | 552737 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 3061277 |
| 1063B | Actual Passengers From Train, inspected | 1038 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew - PreClearance | 281846 |
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections - Maritime | 566136 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 269010 |
| | **Total Passengers Inspected 2004** | **32852211** |
| 1077 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Coop | 820 |
| 1079 | QMIs, Animal Prod/Byprod, Coop, Other | 193 |
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 26950 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 1711 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 441 |
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 52 |
| 1175 | QMIs, Other Animal | 15 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 2178 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 137 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 59 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 8 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 199380 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 22935 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 5003 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 6594 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 217 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 892 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 117017 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 8670 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 688 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 8921 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 16 |
| 1072F | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pax Train | 17 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 13510 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 215 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 586 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 408 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 1133 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 12075 |
| 1099C | QMIs, Inedible Animal | 42 |
| 1132A | Express Mail Meat/Poultry Interceptions | 2801 |
| 1134A | Express Mail Other Animal Products | 410 |
| | **Total Animal Product Interceptions 2004** | **434094** |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 18 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2005
All CBP Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 30105 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 3472 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 6498 |
| 2003 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Foreign | 8271 |
| 2004 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Coastwise | 844 |
| 2005 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Other | 273 |
| | **Total Ships Inspected 2005** | **49463** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 218371 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 37902 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 21703 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 50550 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 3714 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 4921 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 10309 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspected 2005** | **347470** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 557337 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 33854 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected 2005** | **591191** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest - Mail | 426 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pest - Inland Inspection | 77 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage - Maritime | 114 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - Maritime | 5197 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Maritime | 693 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage - Air | 13833 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo - Air | 18106 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Air | 1572 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 680 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 5550 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 6907 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 1171 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - PreClearance | 406 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - PreClearance | 17 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2005** | **54749** |
| | **Total Reportable Cargo Pests 2005** | **30693** |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances - Maritime | 103784 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances - Air | 172275 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 348584 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances | 5019 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances | 11788 |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance | 11427 |
| 2067C | O/T Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 136 |
| 1067C | Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 10343 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2005** | **663356** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections | 83405 |
| 1008C | (Regular Time) Inspections- Regulated Cargo (Container Inspec | 66962 |
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 203413 |
| 1067D | Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 330 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated - Inland Inspection | 1437 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections - Air | 252524 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections | 10696 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections | 46903 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 8875 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect | 22496 |
| 2067D | O/T Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 2 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2005** | **697043** |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance - Maritime | 124810 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances - Air | 229985 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 19 OF 25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 189427 |
| 1068C | Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 121515 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances - Maritime | 768 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances - Air | 22533 |
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance - Truck | 857 |
| 2068C | O/T Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 4330 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2005** | **694225** |
| | | |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections - Air | 149559 |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect - Maritime | 128484 |
| 1009C | (Regular Time) Inspections Misc Cargo (Container Inspection) | 78255 |
| 2093 | O/T Inspections, Misc Cargo, Airport | 3365 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 78552 |
| 1068D | Inspections - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 1181 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous - Inland Inspection | 5632 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections - Maritime | 2480 |
| 2009C | O/T Inspections -Misc. Cargo (Container Inspection) - Maritime | 1807 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections - Air | 20994 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect - Truck | 13381 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2005** | **483690** |
| | | |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 28 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 2 |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 4804 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 1955 |
| 1104 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 115 |
| 1138 | Violations | 633 |
| 1178 | Violations | 16 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 165 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 34 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo | 87 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 | 176 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 | 7 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 | 224 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo | 141 |
| 1138A | Express Mail Violations | 639 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2005** | **9026** |
| | | |
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 497267 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 10448 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 76 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 18923 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 480 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 7136 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 75255 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 4076 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 252975 |
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 85458 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1348 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 50501 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 542 |
| 1071F | Plant QMIs, Passenger Train | 264 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 54410 |
| 1131A | Express Mail Plant Material Interception | 2087 |
| | **Total Plant Interceptions 2005** | **1061246** |
| | | |
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections | 8738137 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 3580767 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 11764447 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 1471252 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger | 302117 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 514675 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 3383697 |
| 1063B | Actual Passengers From Train, inspected | 5421 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew | 167801 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 20 OF 25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 291323 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 377084 |
| | **Total Passengers Inspected 2005** | **30596721** |
| | | |
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 29861 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 430 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 340 |
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 13 |
| 1175 | QMIs, Other Animal | 2 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 2395 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 173 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 26 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 13 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 189040 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 24315 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 4803 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 5855 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 157 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 773 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 90587 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 9596 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 365 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 8472 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 47 |
| 1072F | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pax Train | 43 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 12701 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 267 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 124 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 324 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 146 |
| 1074F | QMIs, Inedible Animal By-Products, Pax Train | 46 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 7955 |
| 1099C | QMIs, Inedible Animal | 20 |
| | **Total Animal Product Interceptions 2005** | **388889** |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2006
All CBP Ports

| Activity Number | Activity Code | Quantity |
|---|---|---|
| 1003 | Ship Inspections, Foreign | 33943 |
| 1004 | Ship Inspections, Coastwise | 4586 |
| 1005 | Ship Inspections, Other | 18297 |
| 2003 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Foreign | 3028 |
| 2004 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Coastwise | 247 |
| 2005 | O/T Inspections, Ships, Other | 51 |
| | **Total Ships Inspected 2006** | **60152** |
| 1031 | Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 133140 |
| 1032 | Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 44340 |
| 1033 | Inspections, Other Aircraft | 24825 |
| 2031 | O/T Inspections, Passenger Aircraft | 7009 |
| 2032 | O/T Inspections, Cargo Aircraft | 1214 |
| 2033 | O/T Inspections, Other Aircraft | 974 |
| 1094 | Inspections, Aircraft | 1491 |
| | **Total Aircraft Inspected 2006** | **212993** |
| 1065 | Railcars Inspected | 629962 |
| 2065 | O/T Inspect, Railcars | 13562 |
| | **Total Railcars Inspected 2006** | **643524** |
| 1136 | Reportable Pest - Mail | 306 |
| 1177 | Reportable Pest - Inland Inspection | 38 |
| 1015A | Reportable Pest, Baggage - Maritime | 23 |
| 1015B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - Maritime | 4875 |
| 1015C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Maritime | 503 |
| 1043A | Reportable Pest , Baggage - Air | 13914 |
| 1043B | Reportable Pest , Cargo - Air | 20397 |
| 1043C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - Air | 1021 |
| 1081A | Reportable From Pedestrian Mandado/Bag | 909 |
| 1081B | Reportable From Passenger Vehicle | 5970 |
| 1081C | Reportable From Border Cargo | 5568 |
| 1081D | Reportable Pest From Buses | 475 |
| 1100B | Reportable Pest, Cargo - PreClearance | 429 |
| 1100C | Reportable Pest, Stores/Qtrs - PreClearance | 16 |
| | **Total Reportable Pests 2006** | **54444** |
| | **Total Reportable Cargo Pests 2006** | **31307** |
| 1008A | Reg Cargo Clearances - Maritime | 108267 |
| 1035A | Reg Cargo, Clearances - Air | 186061 |
| 1067A | Clearances, Regulated Truck Cargo | 397048 |
| 2008A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearances | 1247 |
| 2035A | O/T Reg Cargo Clearances | 3404 |
| 2067A | O/T Cargo, Reg, Clearance | 1529 |
| 2067C | O/T Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 1 |
| 1067C | Clearances - Regulated Rail Cargo | 50200 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Clearances 2006** | **747757** |
| 1008B | Reg Cargo Inspections | 95634 |
| 1008C | (Regular Time) Inspections- Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 64627 |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 22 OF 25

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2006
All CBP Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1067B | Inspections, Regulated Truck Cargo | 222298 |
| 1067D | Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 223 |
| 1170A | Actual Inspections, Regulated - Inland Inspection | 1664 |
| 1035B | Reg Cargo, Inspections - Air | 277839 |
| 2008B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspections | 3746 |
| 2035B | O/T Reg Cargo Inspections | 3802 |
| 2008C | (Overtime) Inspections, Regulated Cargo (Container Inspection) | 2587 |
| 2067B | O/T Cargo, Reg, Inspect | 6235 |
| 2067D | O/T Inspection - Regulated Rail Cargo | 0 |
| | **Total Regulated Cargo Inspections 2006** | **678655** |
| | | |
| 1009A | Misc Cargo-Clearance - Maritime | 95366 |
| 1036A | Misc Cargo, Clearances - Air | 257488 |
| 1068A | Misc Truck Cargo, Clearances | 58401 |
| 1068C | Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 134206 |
| 2009A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearances - Maritime | 239 |
| 2036A | O/T Misc Cargo Clearances - Air | 5087 |
| 2068A | O/T Cargo, Misc, Clearance - Truck | 145 |
| 2068C | O/T Clearances - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 1289 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances 2006** | **552221** |
| | | |
| 1036B | Misc Cargo, Inspections - Air | 190795 |
| 1009B | Misc Cargo-Inspect - Maritime | 140495 |
| 1009C | (Regular Time) Inspections Misc Cargo (Container Inspection) | 104299 |
| 2093 | O/T Inspections, Misc Cargo, Airport | 4898 |
| 1068B | Misc Truck Cargo, Inspections | 44160 |
| 1068D | Inspections - Miscellaneous Rail Cargo | 184 |
| 1170B | Actual Inspections - Miscellaneous - Inland Inspection | 6871 |
| 2009B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspections - Maritime | 789 |
| 2009C | O/T Inspections -Misc. Cargo (Container Inspection) - Maritime | 571 |
| 2036B | O/T Misc Cargo Inspections - Air | 4553 |
| 2068B | O/T Cargo, Misc, Inspect - Truck | 520 |
| | | |
| | **Total Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections 2006** | **498135** |
| | | |
| 1017 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 15 |
| 1024 | Violations, Reported To USCG | 5 |
| 1045 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 7816 |
| 1069 | Violations, Passenger/Pedestrian | 3517 |
| 1104 | Violations, Passenger/Crew | 83 |
| 1138 | Violations | 652 |
| 1178 | Violations | 30 |
| 1018A | Violations, Ship Garbage | 341 |
| 1018B | Violations, Ship Notification | 22 |
| 1018C | Violations, Cargo | 166 |
| 1046A | Violations, Garbage, Pq592 | 199 |
| 1046B | Violations, Notification, Pq592 | 27 |
| 1046C | Violations, Cargo, PPQ592 Or PPQ518 | 464 |
| 1070B | Violations, Cargo | 86 |
| 1138A | Express Mail Violations | 59 |
| | **Total Violations Issued 2006** | **13482** |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 23 OF 25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1037 | Plant QMIs, Baggage | 458986 |
| 1131 | QMIs, Plant | 10258 |
| 1172 | QMIs, Plant | 142 |
| 1010A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 16596 |
| 1010B | QMIs, Plant, Cargo | 508 |
| 1010C | QMIs, Plant, Stores/Qtrs | 6118 |
| 1038B | Plant QMIs, Stores/Qtrs | 84758 |
| 1038C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 3976 |
| 1071A | Plant QMIs, Vehicle | 273106 |
| 1071B | Plant QMIs, Pedestrian | 70905 |
| 1071C | Plant QMIs, Cargo | 1606 |
| 1071D | Plant QMIs, Bus | 43296 |
| 1071E | Plant QMIs, Railcar | 3192 |
| 1071F | Plant QMIs, Passenger Train | 1794 |
| 1098A | QMIs, Plant, Baggage | 65983 |
| 1131A | Express Mail Plant Material Interception | 2433 |
| | **Total Plant Interceptions 2006** | **1043657** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1052 | Passenger/Crew Inspections | 8101980 |
| 1063 | Passengers In Vehicles, number inspected | 3830954 |
| 1064 | Inspected By Agriculture, Pedestrians | 9049739 |
| 2052 | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 367492 |
| 2063 | O/T Inspect, Passenger | 93818 |
| 2064 | O/T Inspect, Pedestrians | 128463 |
| 1063A | Passengers In Buses , inspected | 3381407 |
| 1063B | Actual Passengers From Train, inspected | 30825 |
| 1095B | Inspections, Passenger/Crew | 209573 |
| 2007B | O/T Passenger/Crew Inspections | 137201 |
| 2063A | O/T Inspect, Bus Passenger | 81630 |
| | **Total Passengers Inspected 2006** | **25413082** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1132 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 22151 |
| 1134 | QMIs, Other Animal | 284 |
| 1150 | Reject-Commercial Poultry/Red Meat | 267 |
| 1173 | QMIs, Meat/Poultry Dairy | 28 |
| 1175 | QMIs, Other Animal | 11 |
| 1011A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Baggage | 1589 |
| 1011B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Cargo | 241 |
| 1013A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Baggage | 4 |
| 1013B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 75 |
| 1039A | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Baggage | 159923 |
| 1039B | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Aircraft | 25099 |
| 1039C | Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMIs, Cargo | 8082 |
| 1041A | Inedible Animal QMIs, Baggage | 3925 |
| 1041B | Inedible Animal QMIs, Aircraft | 285 |
| 1041C | Inedible Animal QMIs, Cargo | 936 |
| 1072A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Vehicle | 95542 |
| 1072B | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pedestrian | 9189 |
| 1072C | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Cargo | 679 |
| 1072D | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Bus | 7752 |
| 1072E | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy, Railcar | 88 |

WADS DATA SUMMARY 2006
All CBP Ports

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1072F | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Pax Train | 184 |
| 1074A | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Vehicle | 13479 |
| 1074B | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Pedestrian | 313 |
| 1074C | QMIs, Inedible Animal, Cargo | 50 |
| 1074D | QMIs, Inedible Animal Byproducts, Bus | 190 |
| 1074E | QMIs, Inedible Animal Products/Byproducts, Rail | 64 |
| 1074F | QMIs, Inedible Animal By-Products, Pax Train | 1 |
| 1099A | QMIs, Meat/Poultry/ Dairy | 10613 |
| 1099C | QMIs, Inedible Animal | 87 |
| | **Total Animal Product Interceptions 2006** | **361131** |



EXHIBIT 1
PAGE 25 OF 25

## LAND BORDER PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vehicles Entering | 1060 | 119,691,872 | 121,049,345 | 113,648,047 | 112,615,143 | 115,680,644 | 116,803,918 | 117,533,269 |
| Buses Entering | 1060A | 385,400 | 401,685 | 381,500 | 413,012 | 355,685 | 365,482 | 371,274 |
| **PASSENGER VEHICLES ENTERING:** | | **120,077,272** | **121,451,030** | **114,029,547** | **113,028,155** | **116,036,329** | **117,169,400** | **117,904,543** |
| Secondary Vehicles Inspected | 1062 | 1,155,259 | 1,313,474 | 2;130,598 | 1,471,010 | 1,248,715 | 1,083,783 | 1,244,120 |
| Secondary Buses Inspected | 1062A | 158,188 | 167,641 | 169,205 | 226,290 | 158,517 | 165,824 | 157,605 |
| **PASSENGER VEHICLES INSPECTED:** | | **1,313,447** | **1,481,115** | **2,299,803** | **1,697,300** | **1,407,232** | **1,249,607** | **1,401,725** |
| **Rate of Passenger Vehicles Inspected:** | | **1.09%** | **1.22%** | **2.02%** | **1.50%** | **1.21%** | **1.07%** | **1.19%** |
| Plant QMI's - Vehicle | 1071A | 190,560 | 196,160 | 251,784 | 239,722 | 243,973 | 252,975 | 273,106 |
| Plant QMI's - Bus | 1071D | 32,798 | 31,854 | 34,534 | 35,804 | 38,856 | 50,501 | 43,296 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's - Vehicle | 1072A | 39,153 | 37,394 | 47,142 | 78,272 | 117,017 | 90,587 | 95,542 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's - Bus | 1072D | 5,393 | 5,478 | 4,689 | 6,685 | 8,921 | 8,472 | 7,752 |
| QMI's Inedible Animal - Vehicle | 1074A | 3,019 | 2,878 | 4,259 | 8,336 | 13,510 | 12,701 | 13,479 |
| QMI's Inedible Animal - Bus | 1074D | 703 | 114 | 60 | 1,191 | 408 | 324 | 190 |
| Reportable Pests from Passenger Vehicles | 1081B | 7,351 | 6,922 | 9,162 | 7,152 | 5,860 | 5,550 | 5,970 |
| Reportable Pests from Passenger Bus | 1081D | 909 | 968 | 1,229 | 1,248 | 963 | 1,171 | 475 |
| **PASSENGER VEHICLE INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **279,886** | **281,768** | **352,859** | **378,410** | **429,508** | **422,281** | **439,810** |
| **Rate of Passenger Vehicle Interceptions:** | | **21.31%** | **19.02%** | **15.34%** | **22.29%** | **30.52%** | **33.79%** | **31.38%** |
| Pedestrians Entering | 1061 | 51,279,387 | 52,090,816 | 48,313,111 | 47,693,495 | 48,360,342 | 44,212,303 | 44,414,589 |
| **PEDESTRIANS ENTERING:** | | **51,279,387** | **52,090,816** | **48,313,111** | **47,693,495** | **48,360,342** | **44,212,303** | **44,414,589** |
| Pedestrians Inspected | 1064 | 8,317,648 | 8,486,975 | 8,379,897 | 8,063,274 | 11,676,082 | 11,764,447 | 9,049,739 |
| OT Pedestrian Inspections | 2064 | 437,725 | 439,778 | 508,506 | 649,036 | 663,248 | 514,675 | 128,463 |
| **PEDESTRIANS INSPECTED:** | | **8,755,373** | **8,926,753** | **8,888,403** | **8,712,310** | **12,339,330** | **12,279,122** | **9,178,202** |
| **Rate of Pedestrians Inspected:** | | **17.07%** | **17.14%** | **18.40%** | **18.27%** | **25.52%** | **27.77%** | **20.66%** |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 1 OF 9

## LAND BORDER PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Plant QMI's - Pedestrian | 1071B | 61,392 | 57,095 | 49713 | 47,322 | 66,623 | 85,458 | 70,905 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's - Pedestrian | 1072B | 6,203 | 5,697 | 6,685 | 6,351 | 8,670 | 9,596 | 9,189 |
| QMI's - Inedible Animal - Pedestrian | 1074B | 208 | 87 | 108 | 662 | 215 | 267 | 313 |
| Reportable Pests from Pedestrian Bags | 1081A | 1,541 | 1,000 | 3,632 | 2,119 | 927 | 680 | 909 |
| **PEDESTRIANS/PASSENGERS INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **69,344** | **63,879** | **60,138** | **56,454** | **76,435** | **96,001** | **81,316** |
| **Rate of Pedestrians/Passenger Interceptions:** | | **0.79%** | **0.72%** | **0.68%** | **0.65%** | **0.62%** | **0.78%** | **0.89%** |
| Railcars Inspected | 1065 | 360,865 | 409,034 | 456,288 | 460,144 | 534,039 | 557,337 | 629,962 |
| OT Railcars Inspected | 2065 | 37,672 | 47,124 | 39,398 | 47,314 | 55,403 | 33,854 | 13,562 |
| **RAILCARS INSPECTED:** | | **398,537** | **456,158** | **495,686** | **507,458** | **589,442** | **591,191** | **643,524** |
| Plant QMI's - Railcar | 1071E | 1,211 | 659 | 318 | 103 | 162 | 542 | 3,192 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's - Railcar | 1072E | 2,760 | 2,702 | 827 | 49 | 16 | 47 | 88 |
| QMI's - Inedible Animal - Railcar | 1074E | 5,214 | 3,022 | 732 | 32 | 1,133 | 146 | 64 |
| Reportable Pests - Railcar | 1081E | 538 | 256 | 437 | 280 | 2,003 | 175 | 212 |
| **RAILCARS INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **9,723** | **6,639** | **2,314** | **464** | **3,314** | **910** | **3,556** |
| **Rate of Railcar Interceptions:** | | **2.44%** | **1.46%** | **0.47%** | **0.09%** | **0.56%** | **0.15%** | **0.55%** |
| Regulated Truck Cargo Clearances | 1067A | 175,913 | 143,022 | 160,000 | 179,814 | 245,802 | 348,584 | 397,048 |
| OT Regulated Truck Cargo Clearances | 2067A | 62,406 | 53,704 | 57,538 | 56,993 | 56,677 | 11,427 | 1,529 |
| Miscellaneous Truck Cargo Clearances | 1068A | 396,692 | 34,520 | 456,789 | 912,912 | 340,352 | 189,427 | 58,401 |
| OT Miscellaneous Truck Cargo Clearances | 2068A | 1,678 | 1,343 | 2,175 | 2,186 | 11,881 | 857 | 145 |
| **TRUCK CARGO CLEARANCES:** | | **636,689** | **232,589** | **676,502** | **1,151,905** | **654,712** | **550,295** | **457,123** |
| Regulated Truck Cargo Inspections | 1067B | 99,542 | 92,014 | 94,618 | 107,036 | 146,998 | 203,413 | 222,298 |
| OT Regulated Truck Cargo Inspections | 2067B | 43,583 | 44,482 | 49,050 | 42,726 | 43,894 | 22,496 | 6,235 |
| Miscellaneous Truck Cargo Inspections | 1068B | 24,562 | 28,884 | 39,530 | 186,094 | 60,471 | 78,552 | 44,160 |
| OT Miscellaneous Truck Cargo Inspections | 2068B | 2,956 | 1,992 | 3,703 | 7,985 | 13,222 | 13,381 | 520 |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 2 OF 9

## AIR PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aircraft Inspections - Passenger | 1031 | 246,062 | 258,399 | 223,495 | 210,090 | 230,281 | 218,371 | 133,140 |
| OT Aircraft Inspections - Passenger | 2031 | 62,711 | 63,883 | 66,827 | 54,632 | 50,809 | 50,550 | 7,009 |
| Aircraft Inspections - Cargo | 1032 | 25,664 | 25,997 | 38,907 | 43,436 | 47,526 | 37,902 | 44,340 |
| OT Aircraft Inspections - Cargo | 2032 | 28,526 | 29,262 | 21,095 | 18,228 | 10,801 | 3,714 | 1,214 |
| Aircraft Inspections - Other | 1033 | 19,385 | 19,617 | 24,184 | 28,254 | 24,624 | 21,703 | 24,825 |
| OT Aircraft Inspections - Other | 2033 | 8,927 | 10,821 | 10,493 | 15,427 | 59,889 | 4,921 | 974 |
| Inspections - Aircraft | 1094 | 3,912 | 28,718 | 139,009 | 134,729 | 80,135 | 10,309 | 1,491 |
| **AIRCRAFT INSPECTIONS:** | | **395,187** | **436,697** | **524,010** | **504,796** | **504,065** | **347,470** | **212,993** |
| Plant QMI's - Stores/Quarters | 1038B | 215,687 | 200,705 | 170,954 | 145,050 | 94,376 | 75,255 | 84,758 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's - Aircraft | 1039B | 41,091 | 40,968 | 34,232 | 30,617 | 22,935 | 24,315 | 25,099 |
| Inedible Animal QMI's - Aircraft | 1041B | 140 | 113 | 117 | 206 | 217 | 157 | 285 |
| Reportable Pest QMI's - Stores/Quarters | 1043C | 1,890 | 1,117 | 1,707 | 1,517 | 1,266 | 1,572 | 1,021 |
| **AIRCRAFT INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **258,808** | **242,903** | **207,010** | **177,390** | **118,794** | **101,299** | **111,163** |
| **Rate of Interception Per Aircraft Inspection:** | | **65.49%** | **55.62%** | **39.50%** | **35.14%** | **23.57%** | **29.15%** | **52.19%** |
| Violations - Air Garbage | 1046A | 270 | 141 | 154 | 195 | 168 | 176 | 199 |
| Passenger/Crew Count - High Risk | 1034A | 17,862,893 | 23,523,726 | 25,215,021 | 21,324,044 | 22,045,486 | 23,682,345 | 27,179,002 |
| OT Passenger/Crew Count - High Risk | 2034A | 4,265,277 | 6,203,413 | 6,440,636 | 5,303,752 | 5,305,472 | 4,081,500 | 1,162,738 |
| Passenger/Crew Count - Medium Risk | 1034B | 20,697,854 | 15,891,331 | 9,951,082 | 15,543,116 | 19,708,946 | 23,699,236 | 26,868,736 |
| OT Passenger/Crew Count - Medium Risk | 2034B | 5,921,355 | 4,750,533 | 3,207,036 | 4,635,928 | 4,858,306 | 3,748,730 | 984,487 |
| Passenger/Crew Count - Low Risk | 1034C | 11,748,131 | 10,802,367 | 7,655,013 | 8,183,876 | 8,981,624 | 9,669,201 | 11,809,694 |
| OT Passenger/Crew Count - Low Risk | 2034C | 3,911,175 | 3,419,295 | 2,287,411 | 2,472,576 | 2,369,517 | 1,420,385 | 374,710 |
| **PASSSENGER/CREW ARRIVALS:** | | **64,406,685** | **64,590,665** | **54,756,199** | **57,463,292** | **63,269,351** | **66,301,397** | **68,379,367** |
| Passenger/Crew Inspections (Reg Time) | 1052 | 8,520,507 | 10,189,076 | 8,399,785 | 7,617,620 | 9,730,278 | 8,738,137 | 8,101,980 |
| Passenger/Crew Inspections (OT) | 2052 | 2,228,083 | 2,504,726 | 2,121,370 | 2,195,122 | 2,028,053 | 1,471,252 | 367,492 |
| **PASSENGER/CREW INSPECTIONS:** | | **10,748,590** | **12,693,802** | **10,521,155** | **9,812,742** | **11,758,331** | **10,209,389** | **8,469,472** |
| **Rate of Passenger Inspections Per Arrival:** | | **16.69%** | **19.65%** | **19.21%** | **17.08%** | **18.58%** | **15.40%** | **12.39%** |
| Plant QMI's - Baggage | 1037 | 695,967 | 677,452 | 548,151 | 564,923 | 552,318 | 497,267 | 458,986 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's Baggage | 1039A | 197,799 | 200,496 | 195,100 | 200,990 | 199,380 | 189,040 | 159,923 |
| Inedible Animal QMI's - Baggage | 1041A | 9,311 | 7,871 | 4,506 | 5,292 | 6,594 | 5,855 | 3,925 |
| Reportable Pest QMI's - Baggage | 1043A | 18,846 | 17,509 | 27,076 | 29,514 | 19,581 | 13,833 | 13,914 |
| **PASSENGER/CREW INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **921,923** | **903,328** | **774,833** | **800,719** | **777,873** | **705,995** | **636,748** |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 3 OF 9

## AIR PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Rate of Interception Per Baggage Inspection:** | | **8.58%** | **7.12%** | **7.36%** | **8.16%** | **6.62%** | **6.92%** | **7.52%** |
| Violations - Passengers/Crew | 1045 | 11,170 | 10,282 | 8,722 | 11,198 | 5,165 | 4,804 | 7,816 |
| Regulated Cargo Clearances | 1035A | 63,888 | 79,615 | 103,822 | 100,768 | 98,010 | 172,275 | 186,061 |
| OT Regulated Cargo Clearances | 2035A | 33,302 | 26,034 | 24,520 | 24,319 | 12,089 | 11,788 | 3,404 |
| Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances | 1036A | 280,466 | 505,918 | 339,890 | 348,470 | 508,386 | 229,985 | 257,488 |
| OT Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances | 2036A | 197,510 | 155,070 | 379,956 | 527,657 | 100,241 | 22,533 | 5,087 |
| **CARGO CLEARANCES:** | | **575,166** | **766,637** | **848,188** | **1,001,214** | **718,726** | **436,581** | **452,040** |
| Regulated Cargo Inspections | 1035B | 141,637 | 144,608 | 177,907 | 214,752 | 212,215 | 252,524 | 277,839 |
| OT Regulated Cargo Inspections | 2035B | 153,131 | 140,127 | 133,516 | 125,771 | 86,620 | 46,903 | 3,802 |
| Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections | 1036B | 86,234 | 126,799 | 163,666 | 155,961 | 127,913 | 149,559 | 190,795 |
| OT Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections | 2036B | 17,828 | 25,481 | 42,413 | 48,000 | 20,958 | 20,994 | 4,553 |
| **CARGO INSPECTIONS:** | | **398,830** | **437,015** | **517,502** | **544,484** | **447,706** | **469,980** | **476,989** |
| Plant QMI's - Cargo | 1038C | 4,042 | 4,227 | 3,218 | 5,393 | 4,998 | 4,076 | 3,976 |
| Meat/Poultry/Dairy QMI's - Cargo | 1039C | 1,654 | 2,353 | 4,621 | 7,266 | 5,003 | 4,803 | 8,082 |
| Inedible Animal QMI's - Cargo | 1041C | 288 | 551 | 638 | 2,786 | 892 | 773 | 936 |
| Reportable Pest QMI's - Cargo | 1043B | 13,860 | 14,340 | 14,109 | 15,521 | 16,958 | 18,106 | 20,397 |
| **CARGO INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **19,844** | **21,471** | **22,586** | **30,966** | **27,851** | **27,758** | **33,391** |
| **Rate of Interception Per Cargo Inspection:** | | **4.98%** | **4.91%** | **4.36%** | **5.69%** | **6.22%** | **5.91%** | **7.00%** |
| Violations - Cargo | 1046C | 147 | 200 | 307 | 519 | 329 | 224 | 464 |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 4 OF 9

## MARITIME PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Rate of Passenger/Crew Inspection to Arrivals:** | | **32.64%** | **50.64%** | **59.26%** | **8.57%** | **12.67%** | **11.46%** | **9.67%** |
| QMI's Plant - Baggage | 1010A | 34,519 | 47,028 | 44,257 | 33,950 | 20,909 | 18,923 | 16,596 |
| QMI's Meat/Poultry/Dairy - Baggage | 1011A | 3,333 | 4,443 | 2,127 | 1,785 | 2,178 | 2,395 | 1,589 |
| QMI's Inedible Animal - Baggage | 1013A | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 59 | 26 | 4 |
| Reportable Pest - Baggage | 1015A | 150 | 109 | 111 | 189 | 157 | 114 | 23 |
| **PASSENGER/CREW INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **38,004** | **51,587** | **46,496** | **35,926** | **23,303** | **21,458** | **18,212** |
| **Rate of Passenger/Crew Interception to Inspection:** | | **1.99%** | **1.56%** | **1.24%** | **5.13%** | **2.08%** | **1.61%** | **1.65%** |
| Violations - Passenger/Crew | 1017 | 46 | 24 | 43 | 27 | 17 | | |
| Regulated Cargo Clearances | 1008A | 105,896 | 88,520 | 91,311 | 92,511 | 102,238 | 103,784 | 108,267 |
| OT Regulated Cargo Clearances | 2008A | 4,273 | 6,432 | 5,881 | 4,329 | 5,999 | 5,019 | 1,247 |
| Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances | 1009A | 105,281 | 119,220 | 147,272 | 174,935 | 166,325 | 124,810 | 95,366 |
| OT Miscellaneous Cargo Clearances | 2009A | 1,217 | 749 | 1,695 | 925 | 1,154 | 768 | 239 |
| **CARGO CLEARANCES:** | | **216,667** | **214,921** | **246,159** | **272,700** | **275,716** | **234,381** | **205,119** |
| Regulated Cargo Inspections | 1008B | 69,953 | 68,817 | 73,668 | 80,221 | 83,087 | 83,405 | 95,634 |
| OT Regulated Cargo Inspections | 2008B | 5,160 | 6,729 | 10,596 | 13,319 | 7,443 | 10,696 | 3,746 |
| Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections | 1009B | 101,793 | 127,351 | 143,512 | 146,780 | 147,547 | 128,484 | 140,495 |
| OT Miscellaneous Cargo Inspections | 2009B | 24,439 | 23,955 | 25,204 | 18,522 | 3,931 | 2,480 | 789 |
| **CARGO INSPECTIONS:** | | **201,345** | **226,852** | **252,980** | **258,842** | **242,008** | **225,065** | **240,664** |
| QMI's, Plant, Cargo | 1010B | 907 | 255 | 530 | 758 | 445 | 480 | 508 |
| QMI's Meat/Poultry/Dairy - Cargo | 1011B | 25 | 150 | 134 | 134 | 137 | 173 | 241 |
| QMI's Inedible Animal - Cargo | 1013B | 11 | 155 | 721 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 75 |
| Reportable Pest - Cargo | 1015B | 3,902 | 4,625 | 6,080 | 5,275 | 4,374 | 5,197 | 4,875 |
| **CARGO INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **4,845** | **5,185** | **7,465** | **6,178** | **4,964** | **5,863** | **5,699** |
| **Rate of Interception Per Cargo Inspection:** | | **2.41%** | **2.29%** | **2.95%** | **2.39%** | **2.05%** | **2.61%** | **2.37%** |
| Violations - Cargo | 1018C | 96 | 81 | 31 | 641 | 100 | 87 | 166 |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 5 OF 9

## MARITIME PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ship Arrivals - Foreign | 1001 | 62,253 | 64,833 | 64,514 | 68,354 | 101,657 | 105,688 | 89,505 |
| Ship Arrivals - Coastwise | 1002 | 27,201 | 26,679 | 29,224 | 27,047 | 60,691 | 54,847 | 27,869 |
| **SHIP ARRIVALS:** | | **89,454** | **91,512** | **93,738** | **95,401** | **162,348** | **160,535** | **117,374** |
| Ship Inspections - Foreign | 1003 | 22,946 | 22,956 | 23,904 | 21,648 | 23,859 | 30,105 | 33,943 |
| OT Ship Inspections - Foreign | 2003 | 19,261 | 18,244 | 19,218 | 20,135 | 12,293 | 8,271 | 3,028 |
| Ship Inspections - Coastwise | 1004 | 4,150 | 4,186 | 4,655 | 3,380 | 3,390 | 3,472 | 4,586 |
| OT Ship Inspections - Coastwise | 2004 | 2,119 | 2,552 | 3,485 | 3,007 | 1,522 | 844 | 247 |
| Ship Inspections - Other | 1005 | 3,246 | 3,343 | 3,867 | 6,218 | 7,223 | 6,498 | 18,297 |
| OT Ship Inspections - Other | 2005 | 653 | 735 | 797 | 782 | 409 | 273 | 51 |
| **SHIP INSPECTIONS:** | | **52,375** | **52,016** | **55,926** | **55,170** | **48,696** | **49,463** | **60,152** |
| **Rate of Ship Inspections to Arrivals:** | | **58.55%** | **56.84%** | **59.66%** | **57.83%** | **29.99%** | **30.81%** | **51.25%** |
| QMI's Plant - Stores/Quarters | 1010C | 11,641 | 8,560 | 9,404 | 8,297 | 5,350 | 7,136 | 6,118 |
| QMI's Reportable Pest - Stores/Quarters | 1015C | 1,302 | 1,336 | 1,616 | 1,254 | 635 | 693 | 503 |
| **SHIP INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **12,943** | **9,896** | **11,020** | **9,551** | **5,985** | **7,829** | **6,621** |
| **Rate of Interception to Inspection:** | | **24.71%** | **19.02%** | **19.70%** | **17.31%** | **12.29%** | **15.83%** | **11.01%** |
| Violations - Ship Garbage | 1018A | 195 | 185 | 253 | 122 | 131 | 165 | 341 |
| Violations, Ship Notification | 1018B | 87 | 95 | 83 | 62 | 18 | 34 | 22 |
| **SHIP VIOLATIONS:** | | 282 | 280 | 336 | 184 | 149 | 199 | 363 |
| **Rate of Violation to Inspection:** | | **0.54%** | **0.54%** | **0.60%** | **0.33%** | **0.31%** | **0.40%** | 0.60% |
| Arriving Passengers/Crew Count | 1007A | 5,864,657 | 4,579,445 | 2,425,303 | 3,014,416 | 5,759,276 | 9,492,221 | 10,667,705 |
| OT Arriving Passengers/Crew Count | 2007A | 322 | 1,967,136 | 3,902,486 | 5,167,321 | 3,070,709 | 2,108,068 | 743,787 |
| **PASSENGER/CREW COUNT:** | | **5,864,979** | **6,546,581** | **6,327,789** | **8,181,737** | **8,829,985** | **11,600,289** | **11,411,492** |
| Arriving Passenger/Crew Inspections | 1007B | 1,914,068 | 2,199,678 | 1,910,662 | 421,166 | 552,737 | 1,037,647 | 965,878 |
| OT Arriving Passenger/Crew Inspections | 2007B | 139 | 1,115,288 | 1,839,439 | 279,644 | 566,136 | 291,323 | 137,201 |
| **PASSENGER/CREW INSPECTIONS:** | | **1,914,207** | **3,314,966** | **3,750,101** | **700,810** | **1,118,873** | **1,328,970** | **1,103,079** |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 6 OF 9

## EXPRESS MAIL
## AND
## USPS MAIL PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Express Mail Packages X-Rayed | 1137A | | | | | 41,905 | 108,397 | 58,081 |
| Express Mail Packages Inspected | 1130A | | | | | 60,819 | 65,399 | 66,191 |
| Express Mail Plant Material Interceptions | 1131A | | | | | 2,384 | 2,087 | 2,433 |
| Express Mail Plant Material QMI's | 1131B | | | | | | | 452 |
| Express Mail Meat/Poultry Interceptions | 1132A | | | | | 2,801 | 2,788 | 5,616 |
| Express Mail Other Animal Products | 1134A | | | | | 410 | 887 | 531 |
| Express Mail Packages Reportable Pests | 1136A | | | | | 117 | 158 | 185 |
| **EXPRESS MAIL INTERCEPTIONS:** | | | | | | **5,712** | **5,920** | **9,217** |
| **Rate of Express Mail Interceptions:** | | | | | | **9.39%** | **9.05%** | **13.92%** |
| Express Mail Violations | 1138A | | | | | 73 | 639 | 59 |
| Number of USPS Mail Packages X-Rayed | 1137 | | | 7,574 | 101,844 | 1,020,658 | 16,516,211 | 19,978,008 |
| USPS Mail Packages Inspected | 1130 | 238,321 | 434,987 | 419,597 | 290,015 | 254,918 | 232,367 | 204,827 |
| USPS Mail Plant QMI's | 1131 | 5,252 | 7,526 | 7,855 | 11,719 | 11,793 | 10,448 | 10,258 |
| USPS Mail Meat/Poultry Interceptions | 1132 | 5,957 | 8,686 | 24,348 | 29,006 | 26,950 | 29,861 | 22,151 |
| USPS Mail Other Animal Products | 1134 | 1,304 | 312 | 1,735 | 1,202 | 1,711 | 430 | 284 |
| USPS Mail Packages Reportable Pests | 1136 | 1,443 | 1,870 | 669 | 772 | 768 | 426 | 306 |
| **USPS MAIL INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **13,956** | **18,394** | **34,607** | **42,699** | **41,222** | **41,165** | **32,999** |
| **Rate of USPS Mail Interceptions:** | | **5.86%** | **4.23%** | **8.25%** | **14.72%** | **16.17%** | **17.72%** | **16.11%** |
| USPS Mail Violations | 1138 | 3,545 | 1,537 | 1,375 | 5,040 | 7,485 | 16,376 | 652 |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 7 OF 9

## INLAND PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clearances | 1170 | 73 | 14,514 | 51,279 | 61,759 | 41,560 | 21,681 | 24,950 |
| Actual Inspections, Regulated | 1170A | 40 | 2,469 | 5,255 | 4,976 | 4,479 | 1,437 | 1,664 |
| Actual Inspections, Miscellaneous | 1170B | 372 | 4,860 | 7,575 | 8,056 | 7,843 | 5,632 | 6,871 |
| **INLAND INSPECTIONS:** | | **412** | **7,329** | **12,830** | **13,032** | **12,322** | **7,069** | **8,535** |
| QMI's - Plant | 1172 | 9 | 40 | 80 | 195 | 157 | 76 | 142 |
| QMI's - Meat/Poultry/Dairy | 1173 | 2 | 47 | 42 | 26 | 52 | 13 | 28 |
| QMI's - Other Animal | 1175 | | 4 | 5 | 18 | 15 | 2 | 11 |
| Reportable Pests | 1177 | 6 | 98 | 81 | 87 | 132 | 77 | 38 |
| **INLAND INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **17** | **189** | **208** | **326** | **356** | **168** | **219** |
| **Rate of Inland Interceptions:** | | **4.13%** | **2.58%** | **1.62%** | **2.50%** | **2.89%** | **2.38%** | **2.57%** |
| Violations | 1178 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 25 | 16 | 16 | 30 |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 8 OF 9

## FOREIGN PATHWAYS

| Activity Name | Code | FY2000 | FY2001 | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | FY2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inspections - Aircraft | 1094 | 3,912 | 28,718 | 139,009 | 134,729 | 80,135 | 10,309 | 1,491 |
| O/T Inspections - Regulated Cargo | 2092 | | | | | | | |
| O/T Inspections - MiscellaneousCargo | 2093 | | 1 | 1,579 | | 3,089 | 3,365 | 4,898 |
| **INLAND AIRCRAFT & CARGO INSPECTIONS:** | | **3,912** | **28,719** | **140,588** | **134,729** | **83,224** | **13,674** | **6,389** |
| Reportable Pests - Stores/Quarters | 1100C | 14 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 17 | 16 |
| Reportable Pests - Cargo | 1100B | 383 | 806 | 1,008 | 2,206 | 452 | 406 | 429 |
| **REPORTABLE PESTS:** | | **397** | **808** | **1,022** | **2,218** | **460** | **423** | **445** |
| **Rate of Interception of Pests:** | | **10.15%** | **2.81%** | **0.73%** | **1.65%** | **0.55%** | **3.09%** | **6.97%** |
| Passenger/Crew Count | 1095A | 3,414,749 | 5,214,359 | 9,634,028 | 9,896,241 | 9,772,906 | 10,178,575 | 10,502,215 |
| Passenger/Crew Inspections | 1095B | 133,195 | 217,574 | 517,571 | 491,342 | 281,846 | 167,801 | 209,573 |
| **Rate ofPassenger/Crew Inspection:** | | **3.90%** | **4.17%** | **5.37%** | **4.96%** | **2.88%** | **1.65%** | **2.00%** |
| QMI's - Plant, Baggage | 1098A | 189,083 | 197,897 | 186,019 | 208,057 | 95,417 | 54,410 | 65,983 |
| QMI's - Meat/Poultry/Dairy, Baggage | 1099A | 2,236 | 5,521 | 9,510 | 11,403 | 12,075 | 7,955 | 10,613 |
| QMI's - Inedible Animal, Baggage | 1099C | 383 | 15 | 1,148 | 43 | 42 | 20 | 87 |
| **INLAND QMI BAGGAGE INTERCEPTIONS:** | | **191,702** | **203,433** | **196,677** | **219,503** | **107,534** | **62,385** | **76,683** |
| **Rate of Inland Baggage Interceptions:** | | **143.93%** | **93.50%** | **38.00%** | **44.67%** | **38.15%** | **37.18%** | **36.59%** |
| Violations, Passenger/Crew | 1104 | | | | 0 | 0 | 115 | 83 |

EXHIBIT 2
PAGE 9 OF 9

| FY 2004 | |
|---|---|
| APHIS User Fees | Totals |
| **Air Passenger** | |
| Compliance Checks - Air (A) | $ 7,918,038 |
| Document Review - Air (A) | $ 6,258,993 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Air (A) | $ 27,506,417 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Air (A) | $ 99,461,138 |
| Interception Process - Air (A) | $ 1,717,718 |
| Military Aircraft (A) | $ 1,065,105 |
| **Total Air Passenger** | **$ 143,927,409** |
| **Commercial Vehicle** | |
| Cargo - Land (A) | $ 8,136,206 |
| Document Review - Land (A) | $ 477,184 |
| Truck Traffic (A) | $ 745,741 |
| **Total Commercial Vehicle** | **$ 9,359,131** |
| **Commercial Vessel** | |
| Cargo - Sea (A) | $ 18,924,002 |
| Commercial Vessel (A) | $ 8,275,338 |
| Compliance Checks - Sea (A) | $ 766,685 |
| Document Review - Sea (A) | $ 4,964,731 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Sea (A) | $ 528,619 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Sea (A) | $ 378,875 |
| Interception Process - Sea (A) | $ 1,397,914 |
| Military Vessels (A) | $ 2,507 |
| **Total Commercial Vessel** | **$ 35,238,671** |
| **Rail Car** | |
| Cargo - Rail (A) | $ 2,152,324 |
| Compliance Checks - Rail (A) | $ 25,389 |
| Document Review - Rail (A) | $ 718,183 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Rail (A) | $ 74,850 |
| Interception Process - Rail (A) | $ 437,151 |
| **Total Rail Car** | **$ 3,407,897** |
| **Aircraft Clearance** | |
| Cargo - Air (A) | $ 29,224,979 |
| Courier Mail (A) | $ 1,184,271 |
| Cut Flower Release - Air (A) | $ 178,175 |
| **Total Aircraft Clearance** | **$ 30,587,425** |
| **Total APHIS Cost** | **$ 222,520,533** |

EXHIBIT 3

PAGE 1 OF 3

| FY 2005 | |
|---|---|
| AQI User Fees | Totals |
| **Air Passenger** | |
| Compliance Checks - Air (A) | $ 6,781,755 |
| Document Review - Air (A) | $ 12,542,860 |
| Antiterrorism - Passenger - Air (A) | $ 7,164,843 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Air (A) | $ 47,071,218 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Air (A) | $ 81,338,817 |
| Interception Process - Air (A) | $ 4,391,421 |
| Informed Compliance - Air (A) | $ 377,753 |
| Identify - Air (A) | $ 4,187,511 |
| Non-Intrusive Technology - Passenger - Air (A) | $ 12,735 |
| Military Aircraft (A) | $ 1,130,992 |
| **Total Air Passenger** | **$ 164,999,905** |
| **Commercial Vehicle** | |
| Cargo - Land (A) | $ 5,717,535 |
| Document Review - Land (A) | $ 62,771 |
| Truck Traffic (A) | $ 2,870,245 |
| **Total Commercial Vehicle** | **$ 8,650,551** |
| **Commercial Vessel** | |
| Cargo - Sea (A) | $ 2,202,671 |
| Commercial Vessel (A) | $ 10,112,903 |
| Compliance Checks - Sea (A) | $ 817,730 |
| Document Review - Sea (A) | $ 5,624,376 |
| All Examine - Compliant Passengers - Sea (A) | $ 2,474,187 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Sea (A) | $ 800,326 |
| Antiterrorism - Passenger - Sea (A) | $ 546,845 |
| Informed Compliance - Sea (A) | $ 47,749 |
| Identify - Sea (A) | $ 195,026 |
| Non-Intrusive Technology - Passenger - Sea (A) | $ 67,130 |
| Military Vessels (A) | $ 49,373 |
| Cut Flower Release - Sea (A) | $ 1,116 |
| **Total Commercial Vessel** | **$ 22,939,432** |
| **Rail Car** | |
| Cargo - Rail (A) | $ 1,943,209 |
| Compliance Checks - Rail (A) | $ 41,759 |
| Document Review - Rail (A) | $ 492,040 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Rail (A) | $ 261,358 |
| Interception Process - Rail (A) | $ 33,265 |
| **Total Rail Car** | **$ 2,771,630** |
| **Aircraft Clearance** | |
| Cargo - Air (A) | $ 21,506,923 |
| Courier Mail (A) | $ 994,221 |
| Cut Flower Release - Air (A) | $ 545,413 |
| **Total Aircraft Clearance** | **$ 23,046,557** |
| **Total AQI Cost** | **$ 222,408,076** |

EXHIBIT 3
PAGE 2 OF 3

| FY 2006 | |
|---|---|
| APHIS User Fees | Totals |
| **Air Passenger** | |
| Antiterrorism - Passenger - Air (A) | $ 2,710,903.97 |
| Compliance Checks - Air (A) | $ 5,293,812.24 |
| Document Review - Air (A) | $ 8,029,368.18 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Air (A) | $ 23,152,864.68 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Air (A) | $ 102,069,527.63 |
| Identify - Air (A) | $ 3,517,084.95 |
| Informed Compliance - Air (A) | $ 250,521.07 |
| Interception Process - Air (A) | $ 2,083,332.25 |
| Military Aircraft (A) | $ 1,142,299.67 |
| Non-Intrusive Technology - Passenger - Air (A) | $ 848,018.96 |
| Private Aircraft (A) | $ 4,001,850.46 |
| **Total Air Passenger** | **$ 153,099,584.06** |
| **Commercial Truck** | |
| Cargo - Land (A) | $ 10,905,249.53 |
| Compliance Checks - Land (A) | $ 87,784.29 |
| Compliance Checks - Vehicle (A) | $ 10,343,096.03 |
| Document Review - Land (A) | $ - |
| Military Vehicles (A) | $ - |
| Truck Traffic (A) | $ 1,315,586.29 |
| **Total Commercial Truck** | **$ 22,651,716.13** |
| **Commercial Vessel** | |
| Antiterrorism - Passenger - Sea (A) | $ 362,744.21 |
| Cargo - Sea (A) | $ - |
| Commercial Vessel (A) | $ 14,772,056.50 |
| Compliance Checks - Misc (A) | $ 2,690,727.73 |
| Compliance Checks - Sea (A) | $ 1,085,474.65 |
| Cut Flower Release - Sea (A) | $ 383.38 |
| Document Review - Sea (A) | $ 6,463,414.00 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Cruise (A) | $ 1,235,154.29 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Sea (A) | $ - |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Sea (A) | $ 590,597.38 |
| Identify - Sea (A) | $ 38,750.94 |
| Informed Compliance - Sea (A) | $ 132,954.02 |
| Interception Process - Sea (A) | $ 3,897,966.07 |
| Military Vessels (A) | $ 13,331.16 |
| Private Vessel (A) | $ 4,001,296.70 |
| **Total Commercial Vessel** | **$ 35,284,851.04** |
| **Rail Car** | |
| Cargo - Rail (A) | $ 1,700,807.80 |
| Compliance Checks - Rail (A) | $ 42,510.78 |
| Document Review - Rail (A) | $ 556,114.70 |
| Examine - Compliant Passengers - Rail (A) | $ 135,459.90 |
| Examine - Noncompliant Passengers - Rail (A) | $ 112,514.11 |
| Interception Process - Rail (A) | $ 66,084.14 |
| **Total Rail Car** | **$ 2,613,491.44** |
| **Aircraft Clearance** | |
| Air Fee Audits - Air Landing (A) | $ 73,255.72 |
| Cargo - Air (A) | $ 25,796,139.15 |
| Courier Mail (A) | $ 1,007,010.10 |
| Cut Flower Release - Air (A) | $ 796,432.52 |
| **Total Aircraft Clearance** | **$ 27,672,837.49** |
| **Total APHIS Cost** | **$ 241,322,480.17** |

Note: Costs do not match those on the Statement of Net Costs because these exclude 8 million dollars in costs for services at Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, which we pay out of other sources

EXHIBIT 3

PAGE 3 OF 3

**CBP AQI COSTS**
**INTERCEPTIONS, CARGO,**
**AND AIR PASSENGER**

| Year | Pest Interceptions | Plant Inteceptions | Animal Product Interceptions | Total Interceptions | CBP Cost of AQI Operations | CBP Cost Per Interception |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | 58,522 | 1,061,246 | 434,094 | 1,553,862 | $222,520,533 | $143.20 |
| 2005 | 54,749 | 1,139,160 | 388,889 | 1,582,798 | $222,408,076 | $140.52 |
| 2006 | 54,444 | 1,043,657 | 361,131 | 1,459,232 | $241,322,480 | $165.38 |

| Year | Total Cargo Inspections | Total Cargo Clearances | Total Inspections & Clearances | CBP Cost for Cargo Traffic | CBP Cost Per Inspection & Clearance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | 1,113,616 | 1,686,536 | 2,800,152 | $78,593,124 | $28.07 |
| 2005 | 1,180,733 | 1,357,581 | 2,538,314 | $57,408,170 | $22.62 |
| 2006 | 1,176,790 | 1,299,978 | 2,476,768 | $88,222,896 | $35.62 |

| Year | Total Air Passenger Inspections | CBP Cost For Air Passengers | CBP Cost Per Passenger |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | 11,758,331 | $143,927,409 | $12.24 |
| 2005 | 10,209,389 | $164,999,905 | $16.16 |
| 2006 | 8,469,472 | $153,099,584 | $18.08 |

EXHIBIT 4
PAGE 1 OF 1